DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 441 516 IR 057 836

AUTHOR	Merikangas, Robert J.
TITLE	Historical and Heuristic Frameworks for Shared Governance in Academic Libraries: A Documentary History, Interpretation, and Questions for the Library Council and Others of the University of Maryland.
PUB DATE	1999-05-14
NOTE	91p.; A supplement to "A Brief History of the Management World of the UMCP Libraries" by Robert Merikangas, October 1996.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Libraries; Cooperation; Educational History; Heuristics; Higher Education; *Library Administration; *Organizational Change
IDENTIFIERS	*University of Maryland

ABSTRACT

This study examines the management practice of the libraries of the University of Maryland from October 1996 to spring 1999. The historical dimension focuses on the implementation of the recommendations of internal communication proposals and proposals for service organization changes. The promised move to shared governance is outlined, especially in relation to the new team organizations in Public Services. A large gap between the rhetoric of change in business terminology and the reality of change in library operations is documented. In the heuristic dimension, questions relevant to quality improvement are listed and a few selected references are provided. The audiences are intended to be the Library Council as well as the library management, library staff, and any outside review committees. It should also be of interest to library school faculty and students. (Author)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 441 516

Historical and Heuristic Frameworks for Shared Governance in Academic Libraries

A Documentary History, Interpretation, and Questions for the Library Council and Others of the University of Maryland

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert Merikangas
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Robert J. Merikangas, M.L.S., Ph.D.
University of Maryland
May 14, 1999

IR057836

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Historical and Heuristic Frameworks for Shared Governance in Academic Libraries

A documentary history, interpretation, and questions for the Library Council and others of the University of Maryland.

A supplement to: “A Brief History of the Management World of the UMCP Libraries” by Robert Merikangas, October 1996.

The University of Maryland Libraries
College Park, Maryland

Robert J. Merikangas, M.L.S., Ph. D.
May 14, 1999

TO: Dean of Libraries, Dr Charles B. Lowry, and the campus community

Abstract: This study examines the management practices of the Libraries from October 1996 to Spring 1999. The historical dimension focuses on the implementation of the recommendations of internal communication proposals and proposals for service organization changes. The promised move to shared governance is outlined, especially in relation to the new team organizations in Public Services. A large gap between the rhetoric of change in business terminology and the reality of change in library operations is documented. In the heuristic dimension questions relevant to quality improvement are listed and a few selected references are provided. The audiences are intended to be the Library Council as well as the library management, library staff, and any outside review committees. It should also be of interest to library school faculty and students.

Preface

This document was completed, or, we may say, brought to a conclusion, in the semester after my retirement (on Feb. 1, 1999) from the University of Maryland. This study may be considered as a supplement to my January 1999 exit interview.

I am directing it primarily to the Dean of Libraries, but I am also depositing it in the University Archives and the Paul Wasserman Library (College of Library and Information Services). I suggest the following people might also be especially interested, so I am notifying them of the availability of this document, but not sending them copies, unless they are requested.

Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost: Dr Gregory L. Geoffrey

  - For availability to the Library Council
  - For availability to the committee responsible for periodic review of the dean of libraries' performance
- Chair of College Park Senate: Dr Denny Gulick
  - For availability to Senate committees
- Dean of the College of Library and Information Services: Dr Ann E. Prentice
  - For availability for interested library science faculty and students
- Dr Stephen G. Brush
  - Faculty: author of the Brush Report, continuing advocate for library funding and collection development
- Dr George H. Calcott
  - Former administrator: chair of the library director leadership review committee, author of a history of the university
- Ira Chaleff
  - consultant: author of The Courageous Follower

Background and acknowledgements:

I had been gathering data for this project since the completion of the earlier project, "A Brief History of the Management World of the UMCP Libraries" (October 1996). The earlier document was written primarily for the possible use of the new dean of libraries, Dr Charles Lowry, but I have never received any response from him as to whether he found it useful or even fully read it. I am hopeful that this document will be more useful. The earlier document was also deposited in the University Archives and made available to some individuals who requested copies. I sent a copy to Dr George H. Calcott and he responded with the following remarks in a letter to me:

"Many thanks for sharing with me your cogent history of management of the University libraries.

"You have done a fine job not only of identifying the milestone events of the library's history but also of identifying the evolution of problems. You have placed it all within a philosophical context, and you have presented it clarity and good humor.

"I am sure it has been and will continue to be useful for Dean Lowry. He is fortunate to have on his staff people like you with this broad concern for the institution's welfare."

Dr Calcott is the author of the standard history of the University , and served as vice president (then designated vice chancellor) for academic affairs and provost, and was also the chair of the committee which reviewed the leadership and performance of Dr H. Joanne Harrar, the previous library director. She was subsequently asked or elected to step aside as director.

I hope this follow-up work is also cogent. However, do not expect much good humor.

As I have indicated above, it may be considered an extension of my exit interview. Only so much can be communicated in an oral interview of a little over an hour. Also, the dean did not refer the content of my exit interview to the personnel office. However, we should not expect or require that all exit interviews be accompanied by a similar document. Other documents may well be more appropriate.

Thanks to those who have encouraged me in the previous project and in this project, and to those who have graciously reviewed this text or given me valuable comments and suggestions.

Outline:

A. Purpose, overview, and audience: who might make what use of this document? -- page 3

B. The historic and heuristic approach to major library programs: what are the advantages of this methodology? -- page 9

C. The shared governance in the Libraries: what progress is being made? - page 10

D. The current dynamics of the programs in a library organization: How do we form judgments? What do we want to measure? -- page 40

E. Management and planning services: how and to what degree do they help? -- page 76

A. Purpose, overview, and audience: who might make what use of this document?

This document has been compiled for the use of all those involved in the shared governance of the Libraries at the University of Maryland. As a heuristic document, it is designed to be of use in discovering how well things have been going and are going, in order for all to work together for improvement. It is a reflection, and interpretation of the recent history of the Libraries, and so is in part a supplement to the previously written management history. As a narrative it is clearly incomplete in a number of ways, but I hope that is still is of value in opening up directions for further inquiry, judgment, and then decision making.

Audiences: The primary audience is the Library Council, which is the group primarily responsible for the oversight of the work of the Libraries on campus, and the performance of the dean of Libraries as seen by the campus community and the library staff (for information to his supervisor, the provost). The periodic formal review of the performance of the dean might be the occasion of specific oversight judgments, but we assume that the larger issues involve the work of all those in the Libraries, and how they work together and in collaboration with the campus community.

The charge to the Library Council is provided in Sections 5.2 and 7.4 of the College Park Senate bylaws. The scope of activities to carry out the oversight responsibility of a Council is large. In addition to the general Council responsibilities of gathering data, reviewing, advising, in relation to both the administrative officer (the provost) and the unit's director (the dean of libraries), the Council shall be governed by the following:

"Policy review by the Council shall include review and recommendations for major changes and improvement in policies, operations and services of the libraries. These reviews shall consider the concerns and interests of the Senate constituencies and other users of the libraries. Recommendations for change shall include specification of resource implications." (from motion establishing the University Library Council).

It should be noted that the Library Council itself will be reviewed five years after it was formed, which was in Sept. 1994. Therefore in Sept 1999 the review will take place:
"Five years after the Council is formed by the Senate and the Provost, a review of the Council will be undertaken jointly, and a written report will be made to both the Campus Senate and the Provost. Such a review may recommend continuation of the Council in its present form and mode of operation, modification of the Council structure and/or operations, or discontinuance of the Council."

The document will demonstrate how complex the work of the Libraries is, and thus may seem to be more than members of the Council can handle. However, it would be possible for each member of the Council to take a particular part of the library systems or connections for close attention and study, and all could pool their knowledge and judgments. In addition, to the extent that this is a source of questions, the relevant questions could be posed directly to the appropriate library staff and much could be learned in direct conversations.

It may seem odd that this document is being provided by a former staff member rather than directly by the dean himself, but such is the case. Certainly the dean could have provided such a document, since it was clearly intended in the

establishment of the Council that this kind of support might be and should be provided:
"The Director [sic] of the Libraries will provide the Council with internal data, reports, studies, etc., as needed to support the Council's work. The Directory will also arrange for Unit staff to present such testimony concerning such reports, etc., as the Council finds useful in carrying out its responsibilities. The Director's assistance to the committee shall also include providing the Council members with the opportunity to attend an appropriate orientation session dealing with the Libraries." (from the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Establish a Library Council).

This document could then be seen as an aid to this orientation, as well as to the work on the ongoing responsibilities. The author is also willing to converse with the Council upon request, at no charge. It is extremely unfortunate that it has been difficult in recent years to have the continuity of a chair for the Library Council.

The secondary audience is the staff of the Libraries, who are seeking to move toward greater involvement in shared governance themselves. Many of the points will deal with the progress or lack of progress in implementing shared governance, and so questions and action plans might be generated by the staff from the document. A subset of the staff with special interest in the document might be the top level managers and the management information system staff.

The tertiary audience is the potential members of visiting review groups, such as Middle States review teams or a team of librarians from other ARL institutions. Self-studies are often aided by the questions and perspectives of visiting experts with experience in the assessment of libraries and their work.

Overview:

Working out a common understanding of the Libraries' goals so that common work and evaluation can be undertaken is clearly part of the whole process of management and shared governance. To the extent that some sense that the roles of libraries are undergoing basic changes or paradigm changes, the situation becomes more complex. Areas of possible major change include:

-roles of libraries in the new Information Society or Knowledge Age

-roles of university libraries changing as universities change their work and their modes of research and teaching

-changes in management and staff participation in businesses and other organizations, including educational institutions and libraries

Some assumptions of the interpretations offered here:

-the essential roles of libraries are remaining the same, but the technology used and specific methods of organizing knowledge are being developed and changed

-management is committed to changing, toward the shared governance the campus is already committed to and beyond, toward democracy in the workplace, especially for knowledge workers like librarians.

-as organizations, libraries should be managed as "learning organizations."

Reference:

Worrell, Diane. "The Learning Organization: Management Theory for the Information Age or New Age Fad?", Journal of Academic Libarianship (Sept. 1995), 351-357.

We may sum the role of libraries and librarians by saying that they gather and index documents and organize knowledge (I deliberately avoid the generic term "information").

Here is a somewhat classic definition by J.G. Meijer:
"Librarianship is a form of cultural enterprise whose main characteristic is the stimulation of the optimum use of mankind's [sic] cultural heritage insofar as it consists of coded thoughts recorded in documents that are and must be held in readiness for use with the ultimate objective of making possible cultural progress (also in the fields of religion and science) in its particular sphere."

What do we think of the statement that librarians want their collections to be used? And used for good ends? If we agree, then librarians are not going to be purely responsive in the community, but will engage in educational outreach. They may even encourage people to read and study. They may even try to help people distinguish good from bad, and to find critical and creative alternatives to presently dominant ideologies and systems. They may even try to be good models of such behavior.

Librarians as professionals work with clients, and calling them customers is misleading, although even in higher education some find the market responsibility implication useful. Their responsibilities are more to society than to individuals, and decisions as to what services are offered normally have to be negotiated with the larger community, not with individuals, although negotiations with individuals are needed for specific helping situations between professionals and clients and between all library staff and library users.

The role of librarians as professionals is one of the issues in the governance of the libraries. The statement of the service philosophy refers to staff, never to librarians or to librarianship, implying a more bureaucratic than professional perspective. What would we think of a general philosophy of the university that would refer to the staff of the university in an undifferentiated manner and not to the specific importance of the faculty? This is not part of the formal documentation here, but it should be noted (and perhaps be inquired into) that some librarians feel that the dean has no or little respect for them as librarians and as professionals. This, be it carefully noted, is stated as a perception.

The theme running through this study is accountability and the possibilities for greater accountability. How do librarians and those they work with hold themselves and each other accountable for the good work they should do? History helps us see where we have been accountable the past, and a system of heuristics helps us to be accountable in the future.

One way to think of accountability is in terms of measuring the outcomes of what we do, so that we are accountable for results, not just effort. Various aspects of this approach will come up in this document, but no effort will be made to deal comprehensively with outcome measures for every situation. For an excellent overview of the possibilities, which should be investigated, see:

Lindauer, Bonnie Gratch. "Defining and Measuring the Library's Impact on Campuswide Outcomes," College & Research Libraries 59: (Nov. 1998), 546-563.

The methods of action research, prominent in some areas of education, offer many possibilities, but we do not yet have easily available 'best practices' in this field for libraries. Perhaps now is the time to begin.

Members of the Library Council as well as the librarians should keep up with the current issues of College & Research Libraries, the main scholarly journal for university libraries.

Basic references: Librarians and their colleagues who are working together on improving libraries should have a common language and probably a common set of concepts with which to discuss the issues and the frame the development of the detailed planning and evaluating heuristics. I suggest the following as basic reading for all:

Buckland, Michael. Redesigning Library Services: A Manifesto. Chicago: American Library Association, 1992.

Crawford, Walt, and Michael Gorman. Future Libraries: Dreams, Madness, and Reality. Chicago: American Library Association, 1995.

It might be objected that those outside the libraries need not know much about or be concerned with the internal workings of the libraries. To the contrary, I contend that any board, council, visitors, or others with any oversight responsibilities for the successful operations and services of a library or any organization should be concerned with both the internal operations and the quality of services provided by the organization. Of course the two aspects are inextricably linked, so that even a focus on the management and leadership of the top person, such as a dean of libraries, would lead to inquiry into both internal management and the relations with the outer world of suppliers and users, now often called "customers." It is the proposition of this document that the wisdom a board needs for responsible oversight requires those elements needed by all wisdom communities, that is, the symbols, the systems, and the stories.

Reference:
Merikangas, Robert J. "Heuristics for Wisdom Communities," Futures Research Quarterly, 14:2 (Summer 1998), 67-95.

These three S's may be taken, as an introduction, to stand for the following components of understanding:

(1) symbols - the statements and metaphors expressing the core mission and principles of the enterprise. What does the organization, here, the library, believe in, concerning themselves and their own professional identities, their vocations to serve others -- what do they want to contribute? The symbols of libraries these days be books and computer workstations, but libraries are, more generally, places, collections, indexing systems, and people. Libraries serve many people, not the least of which are future generations. Academic research libraries are part of a number of local, regional, and international library systems, and their governance and improvement cannot be considered without attention to those systems and their existence over time, so the symbols of meaning and purpose will be complex.

In his excellent overview, Redesigning Library Services: A Manifesto (1992), Michael Buckland describes three libraries which coexist and interact:
the paper library: paper collections
the electronic library: electronic, digital collections
the automated library: the use of computers for technical operations, cataloguing, and circulation

The online catalog symbolizes the library as a whole, in that it indexes the print and electronic collections -- but how well does it do that? How easy is it to access the information about the collections and the information in the collections?

(2) systems -- the effectiveness of a library depends on the good operation of many interconnected systems, often computerized, but operated more or less well by people. Are the new and old books on the right shelves in the right order? They are if people put them there. Are all the materials corrected cataloged? They are if people have done it. Of course, people may disrupt as well as help the systems, and users have been known to steal and mutilate books, hackers disprupt computer files -- no system has been able to prevent this, but some systems replace and restore damaged and missing materials promptly and some don't.

Given our symbols of purpose, how well do the systems perform?

(3) stories -- stories tell what actually happens. The historian of the library world asks: what really happened? Were glorious goals implemented in

effective systems? Or were lists of values rarely translated into working relationships and performance? Do real people get what they really want, or, even better, what they really need but didn't know they really needed, form these systems? Only the multitude of stories show what happens over time, as staff do and re-do their processing, and users visit and re-visit the collections. Whether funding is enough, and where it falls short, whether funds were well allocated, used prudently or not, whether management decisions and leadership actions helped improve systems or not, whether staff are actively involved in continuous improvement or not -- only time tells.

This reflection tries to bring together the questions that arise from symbols, systems, and stories, and apply them to the recent past and propose them for the near future.

B. The historic and heuristic approach to major library programs: what are the advantages of this methodology?

What can we learn from a review of the recent past? What questions to ask, to guide our actions and evaluations?

In the previous history a justification was given for strong attention to the history of management. We could also learn a great deal from the personal stories or biographies or work autobiographies.
Reference:
Watson-Boone, Rebecca. Constancy and Change in the Worklife of Research University Librarians. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1998.

In this report all names are changed in the midwest university called MIRI-U, but an effort is made to give a feel for the library worklife from the perspective of the librarians, with many quotations. The report offers generalizations, often linked to the literature:

"MIRI-U librarians evaluate administrators on the basis of how frequently librarians' input is sought and incorporated into decisions, by how much administrators know about what librarians do and need, and by how they support librarians.

"Uniformly, MIRI-U librarians dislike administrators who want things their own way and exclude librarians from decision-making. The fundamental issue is whether control over primary work is to be exercised by administrative personnel or the librarians closest to the work (Friedson 1986; Trice 1993)." (p. 63)

"Worse than exclusion is feeling that one's input has been ignored after being requested. Several librarians comment independently on this situation:

> Mary: Things get studied or played with or mapped around a lot, and then they disappear. So you put your heart into something that's special to you, and it's gone. . . . I've heard too many stories from too many people about

> being encouraged to work on this idea or that idea or this project, and that happens and then it's gone. Because something else has moved up as a priority or an urgent need or whatever." (p. 64)

This book is excellent for giving an outsider a view of the life of a professional librarian in a university and complements this study.

In one sense this document is part of the author's personal history, but is both more and less: more in that areas are covered in which I had no direct involvement, and less in that I have not reported all my personal activities, attempts at intervention, and subjective reactions. Howover, my decision to retire when I did was certainly not unrelated (to use a double negative) to a fair degree of discouragement with the possibilities of being able to make a positive difference in the near future.

We need to interpret the past.

Edgerton:

"One *interprets* because of the inavoidable presence of the past; one*interprets* for the sake of the future; one *interprets* in order to shape the story of the future by reshaping the story of the past." (1992, 32)

We need to be critical of what is claimed in our interpretations. For an example of a critical approach which provides a model for us:

Schied, Fred M., and others. "Complicity and Control in the Workplace: A Critical Case Study of TQM, Learning, and the Management of Knowledge," International Journal of Lifelong Education, 17:3 (May/June 1998), 157-172.

This study reveals the gap between what management said, and what they did, the gap between the ostensible purposes of a TQM program and adult education program, and what the real purposes were and what actually happened. The views/stories told by management and by workers were quite different, and the consultant brought in to implement a training program came to realize that she was "complicit in corporate strategy to reshape and disempower the workforce." (p. 169)

The setting in that study is quite different from the university, but it may serve as a cautionary tale, to be kept in mind as we tell the tale of shared governance in the library workplace.

C. The shared governance in the Libraries: what progress is being made?

In advertising open position descriptions, the following statement is made under "environment":

"The University of Maryland Libraries is moving to a team-based organization that incorporates elements of matrix management to improve services to our users, facilitate organizational communications, and foster an environment of shared responsibility."
What does this mean?
What does it mean to the managers and to the staff?
What moving is actually taking place?
How is this movement perceived by managers and by staff?

The basic statement covering the operations of the Libraries is the "Scholarly Information Service Philosophy." This statement should be kept in hand when discussing or evaluating the work of the libraries, since it states the major program goals and the modes of work. It calls for the "continuous assessment of user needs" and "ongoing evaluation of our programs and services." The work environment:
"The environment in which we work fosters not only individual initiative but also collaboration, teamwork, partnerships, communication, peer support, and shared ownership and accountability for the quality of our services."

There is no evidence that the loftly goals in this text are being used on an ongoing basis for program evaluation. But they could be.

The metaphoric language of shared governance needs to be examined critically, since we humans are constantly tempted to succumb to our ideologies, which often serve to give legitimacy to whatever we want to do; in many systems, the interests of those running things, the elites at the top, will always be given priority over those for whose sake the systems is supposedly being run.

What do faculty on university campuses think of the meaning of shared governance today? Probably many see it as lip-service to the presumably historic role of the faculty, used by administrators, who really have to power, to gloss over what really happens and how decisions are really made. Many faculty have little hope of reversing this direction of the move of power. That is why this document, which dares to take the rhetoric of shared governance seriously as a viable mode of organizational life and vitality, may seem amusingly naive to many. Naive, yes, but hopefully the "second naivete" which places some hope in transformational changes, which have been known to occur in history, although we may seem to be in the valley of despondency. The pilgrim's journey goes on. The imagination which sees institutional progress based on shared governance does not have to be eschatological.

CONTEXT

As with all corporate actors these days, the Libraries are connected with many actors as they work out their governance. These actors include:

Library management and staff
UM administrative hierarchy
College Park Senate
Senate Staff Affairs Committee and other committees (Programs, etc.)
Library Council
  accountable to administration and Senate
library users
  academic units, departmental liaisons
  in the past: student advisory committee
  library users, making suggestions: using forms, suggestions, book requests, circulation forms, etc.
  library users: those who mutilate and steal materials
campus Personnel offices
  PRD coordinator
campus ombus people (especially for staff, Roberta Coates)
Friends of the Libraries
benefactors, some of whom attach conditions to their gifts
AFSCME officials, members
MCEA officials, members

UM library directors
Maryland Library Association
  Library Management Division
academic library directors in maryland (CALD)
consortia and library organizations which the Libraries belong to or have arrangements with

accrediting agencies
news media
  Diamondback
  Outlook

HISTORY

The present author had hopes that the stop-and-start management efforts of the previous decades would be superseded by an organized attention to the various library systems as systems, and perhaps the Libraries could even rise to the level of the "learning organization" as outlined by Peter Senge in the valuable work, The Fifth Discipline (this work had been specifically recommended to the previous director). In order to express this hope as a proposal, I sent the following message to Dean Lowry on Feb. 24, 1997. He responded with detailed comments in an email on March 1, 1997. I report this exchange of views in detail, and suggest that it is an example of a beginning dialogue that might have taken place with the librarians as a whole if we had formed a librarians' council of some kind. Such a forum still has not been formed. The dean's text is in italics:

"TO: Dean Charles Lowry
FROM: Bob Merikangas
RE: Library systems

Bob,

Just now have time to give a thoughtful response to your message of last week. At a top level, I think that the key issue implied in your observations is that we do not have a "place" to lodge the planning function in the Libraries. This is not to say that planning is discombobulated, merely that no one owns it outright and this leads to a certain discontinuity of effort. I will be giving some serious attention to this problem in the next weeks and months -- but more on that when I can be explicit. I have responded with a few thoughts in the context of your message.

I propose that we develop our knowledge of our library systems and use our models of our systems to communicate and plan. We should model and explicate our interconnected systems in a number of contexts:

ANSWER: I do believe that modeling is one component of the planning function which should be used to effectively coordinate Libraryies' strategic plan. However, it is hardly sufficient in and of itself. Benchmarking, process engineering, program budgeting, etcx. are easily as important or more important. One of the problems with using modeling is that many will see it as an "intellectual exercise" if it hasn't got some concrete dimension.

staff orientation and training, and subsequent staff communication systems

ANSWER: We should be able to kick off an effective training program once we complete the reclass of the HR position we have targeted as Library Trainer and hire a competent professional to do this work. So are as communication is concerned, you are aware that we have a CQI team report which is now being implemented and I have taken up the role of sponsor for the team. Their initial report contained so many recommendations that they/ve had to sub-divide into several teams and recruit new membership. My guess is that they will complete their work in the upcoming year and then look for new mountains to climb. I'll see too [sic] *it that they get support. You will recognize the high priority I place on the issue of communication.*

orientation of members of Library Council

ANSWER: One can be too aggressive in suggesting to the ULC what their agenda should be. I really see them as our "sounding board" on policy and service matters and they must take the lead on developing strategies for data gathering to make their deliberations and subsequent recommendations to me and the Provost. It is a bit of a challenge to put them through an "orientation" when they are already up to their necks in the effort of reviewing/recommending on the CQI Undergraduate report and on a major revision of the strategic plan which we are rolling out.

policy forums and deliberations, such as the future librarians' organization and the Library Council

ANSWER: well OK, we use forums (such as the upcoming one on the CQI study) whenever they seem appropriate. And, yes I see both the ULC and a "Library Council" as the right deliberative bodies for such debate. I think the formation of the "Library Council" (or whatever we call it) will be a near-term effort that shoud [sic] naturally follow the implementation of the promotion plan which creates the right professional context for such as body. I remain uncertain about the timing of this, but would guess during the next twelve months. What I don't want is to pile on too much new "governance" activity so that nothing gets done well.

clarification of library service policies on paper and on our website

ANSWER: This is being worked on already by the CQI Communications team and the first step is the creation of a uniform presentation of Libraries policy. We will also need a method for revision and this too may be a planning function.

As example of general treatments of library systems we could begin with:
Redesigning Library Services by Michael Buckland (I recommend that this book be given to each Library Council member)
Library Services in Theory and Context by Michael Buckland
(Plus a basic bibliography to help us generate a common vocabulary)
Once we have models of our systems (such as acquisitions, cataloging, user assistance) then we can display the trade-off decisions to be made on many levels. (I have lists of these as examples.) In each context and trade-off we can also identify the value-added contributions by library staff, and the trade-offs in staff time to accomplish these.

ANSWER: I would disagree with you that such a 'textbook" approach would be very well received by the ULC. They are in my view likely to see this as a bit of *a waste of time if not condescending. Its OK for the Libraries' own planning process to adopt a systems/models approach, but I would be more inclined to use it in the background rather than as a centerpiece.*

I also suggest the CQI teams be assigned and work in relation to specific library systems for which are responsible on a continuing basis, so that we dno't have the continuation of teams preparing action plans which are they dropped because no one is accountable or empowered to carry out the changes to present systems.

ANSWER: I do not know of the work of any CQI team that has been in operation since I arrived that is not being attended to seriously. It is certainly important to assure that their efforts are never wasted in the way you suggest they may have been in the past. Can you name such instances? In addition, I believe that CQI teams are really planning bodies and should be created and coordinated in that context, but as I said more later on that.

I also propose that we consider the ability to think in terms of systems and to work with systems to be of the greatest importance in selecting a new Associate Director for Public Services.

Answer: Maybe, perhaps we should ask questions to get at this quality. I would suggest that "systems thinking" is just part of a good analytical ability which we're looking for in our candidates.

This is the end of that early 1997 exchange of messages.

October 1996 to Spring 1997: Preparation of strategic plan and budget requests by the dean and selected advisors.

Spring 1997- summer 1998.
Services Task Force and Space Planning and Implementation Team prepare recommendations, which are then put in process of implementation.

Reorganization:
The Public Services Division was reorganized as a result of the Services Task Force recommendations, with a move to what has been called matrix management, and at times the claim that there is flatter management. There were two majors kinds of changes: a change in the hierarchical structure and the formation of subject groupings of professional librarians, called teams. The basic organization change meant more levels of command, as fewer managers were to report to the director (as the position is now called) of Public Services. The head of McKeldin Circulation now reports to a new position, head of access services, along with the head of ILL (who is also now the manager of Access Services). A new position was created, the manager of McKeldin Public Services,

to whom report Periodicals/Microforms, Government Documents/Maps, Service Plus desk. As a result, the librarians working at the information/reference desk now have the following levels above them in that capacity: manager of Service Plus, manager of McKeldin Public Services, director of Public Services. Before there was only the head of McKeldin Reference, reporting to director of Public Services.

There seemed to be no general sequence of meetings or agenda for those reporting to the manger of McKeldin Public Services, but this history will not deal with the possible functions of that position.

The major change was in the creation of three teams, the Arts and Humanities Team, the Science and Technology Team, and the Social Sciences and Allied Professions team. Some of the team members work in branch libraries, others in McKeldin. Those in branches continue their responsibilities (and coordination under the manager of branch libraries), and add on the team connections. Those in McKeldin work in the following areas, with the indicated reporting or coordinating relationships:

McKeldin service desk: manager of Service Plus Information and Research Services Center
collection development in subject areas: Director of Collection Management and Special Collections, with coordination by the coordinator, chair of the new coordinating committee
collection development of McKeldin Reference collection: manager, Service Plus Information and Research Services Center
general user education workshops: manager of User Education
in-depth reference in subject areas: team manager or branch librarian
library instruction in subject areas: team manager
general liaison with assigned departments: team manager
development of electronic resources: manager of Electronic Reference Services

The librarians coordinate reference service and library instruction with Government Documents, which covers all subject areas.
In addition, the team librarians work with Technical Services on acquisitions, cataloging, processing, and preservation procedures and issues, and report problems in all these areas.

In April 1998, some staff expressed concern that the organization was not flatter, but in fact the Director of Public Services seemed even less accessible than before. In response, the director, Lori Goetsch, sent a kind of position paper by e-mail to the staff in her division. There was no forum to discuss these matters. Some extracts:

"To move the organization towards the environment, culture, and goals described in the [task force] reports, we have had to make many decisions that reflect the complexity and challenge inherent in any effort so comprehensive in its goals. It has been said that some of the decisions appear to be contradictory. Many of the concerns that have been directed to me relate to one of those contradictions -- another 'layer of management' in the division. A few people have proposed to me that we need a more horizontal, less hierarchical organizational structure, and, for many reasons, I believe in a 'flatter' structure myself. However, it is not only in the organizational chart and the hierarchy of management relations that a flat organization is achieved. The character of decision-making, communication, and planning through participation is a much better measure of 'flatness.' This seems to me to be where to place our emphasis. . . . The managerial structure we are implementing is necessary, from my perspective, to allow me to fully invest my energies in implementing these plans by providing a narrower span of control, improving cross-functional coordination and stability, facilitating communication, and speeding the decision-making process. . . . It is also my observation that the environment here is so accustomed to bureaucracy that it is going to take some time for people to feel comfortable in a more empowered setting. . . . The important thing here is not the structure so much as it is the need to build a work culture that inculcates the service philosophy and translates it into our day to day activity."

The members of the teams were notified of their assignments in personal letters at the beginning of August 1998. Each team member was designated with one of two position titles and given subject areas, which usually corresponded to campus departments. To quote the assignment letter: ". . . assignments are designated either Refefence/Instruction Librarian or Collection Management Librarian. These titles are intended to reflect differential workload balances depending on the needs of the subject area. Team managers will work with team members to clarify workloads as new job descriptions and PRDs are developed."

[in spring 1999 this process is still taking place]

The size of the book funds for a subject area was a key factor in determining whether a position should be collection management or not. More funds would mean more time to spend them.

One major question was what titles for librarians would be given to the campus faculty and students: the same ones which were being used internally to designate differentials in workloads? Previously the list of librarians for departments was two lists: one of bibliographers and one of reference librarians. Now there would be one list, usually with one librarian for each department (two in some cases). (Vacancies meant someone was needed to cover until the new person is hired.)

Robert Merikangas sent an email (August 24, 1998) to managers, which said in part:

I think we all need the same designation, such as 'subject specialist" or "research librarian" since we all do the same thing for them -- collections and assistance. The distinctions we have internally between collection management and reference/instruction would be incomprehensible to others and not helpful to them."

Here is the reply from Lori Goetsch, on Aug. 25, 1998:
Bob -- I agree that we should all use a common designation. A couple of other possibilities for consideration: subject librarian, liaison librarian, subject liaison. I'm in the process of drafting a letter to deans, dept heads, etc. to go out under the dean's signature explaining the new team structures, so that seems to be the likely place to introduce this name/label. Desider is out this week and I'd like him to weigh in with his two cents, and I've also copied Diane as soc sci team leader for her views. We'll settle on something asap!

The dean's letter was dated Sept. 3, 1998. His letter used the same differential designations given to the librarians. He did state that "these teams integrate functions of reference service, user education, and collection development." He did not indicate the meaning of the different position titles.

The dean did not mention the process that the teams had to begin, that of deciding responsibility for subject areas not designated by colleges and departments, such as film studies, broadcasting, and religion. Law, which should have been in the unassigned category, since there is no law school or department, had been assigned to Diane Harvey. No mention was made of the special collections librarians (East Asia, Marylandia, archives, etc.) or the role of the library of the College of Library and Information Services (and the connections to the library science collection in McKeldin).

Note: this letter stated that the Hornbake circulating collection had been closed, and would be transferred to McKeldin "during the next several months." Plans for the transfer of the bulk of the circulating collection to other locations, such as McKeldin or storage have not yet been revealed.

One librarian, Jerri Kenny,who had been working with the History Department for years on reference and library instruction, expected to continue with that assignment. Instead, she was given an assignment outside the team structure, to assist the manager of Service Plus with the reference collection. She objected strongly, took her concerns directly to the History Department, and after several interviews with the dean and others was reinstated with her work, which she continued until her retirement in January 1999. She felt that her contributions and the needs of the department had been disregarded.

The teams started meeting as teams by the end of August and moved into their new locations.

How do the librarians who are members of the new teams in the new "team-based organization" using "elements of matrix management" perceive this situation? Before dealing with this question, we need to recall the sequence of events beginning in August 1998.

Recommendations of the CQI Team on Internal Communications:
Summary of status as of August 31, 1998, published in Library Matters, based on some members of the original CQI team doing an evaluation:
Here is a list of recommendations not yet addressed or implemented:
Associate Directors visit each unit 3/4 times per year: apparently not done.
Photoboard: online one created, not in each department.
Create a mentoring program: none.
Create an association to which all staff has the option for membership (this was also recommended the Work Culture Task Force): no action.
Training programs that cross boundaries: sessions have been held, but no ongoing programs are seen.
Form task force to deal with written manuals and procedures throughout the library system: no done; some procedures are on the Web.
Design training and development programs to meet expressed needs: no visible progress on this, other than training by consultant in running meetings. What ongoing work is the training coordinator doing?
Provide workshops on the channels and methods the UMCP Libraries use to communicate: no action.
Implement standardized training program for all student assistants: no action.
Circulate LEC minutes: Some minutes have been sent by e-mail. In the period. From Oct-Dec 1996, for 8 meetings, there were 5 minutes sent. For Jan-Dec 1997, for 26 meetings there were 6 minutes sent. For Jan-Dec 1998, for 30 meetings, there were 12 minutes sent. The reason given for the lack of minutes was the heavy workload on the secretary. The recommendation of the subteam that minutes of other groups be available systematically and that minutes be archived on the Web has not been acted upon.
Create additional teams: The evaluation states" "While teams have been created to address problems, etc. , we have found that the teams are composed of the same staff members. In addition, the teams continue to be the predominantly hierarchical culture of the library, rather than more inclusive in the spirit of CQI."
Staff suggestion system: The subteam expanded on this recommendation. No action taken, except for an unrelated recognition system for awards to selected individuals for their initiatives.
The following recommendations are listed as not yet addressed:
Provide an avenue for library staff to have a consultative role in administrative decision making.
Library staff who will be directly affected by policy dicisions and/or issues should be consulted by the LEC during their consideration

Managers and administrators should establish an aveneue for individual feedback on administrative decisions and initiatives and should be responsive to such feedback. Techniques that could be used include divisional reflectors and focus groups.

What is highlighted here is the lack of staff involvement in decision making.

The Work Culture Task Force has proposed a staff advisory body. The dean has long promised that a body of librarians would be formed as a council, has he has done in other institutions. Should there be one body, with representatives of all levels of staff, including student assistants? or a general body and also a body representing all professional librarians? The shared governance model on campus in the academic units would have both: the librarians, similar to the faculty, would meet with the dean, and a separate collegiate body would have representatives from all staff.

Such bodies (which existed in some form years ago) need to be designed and implemented, all agree. There seems to be no action because the dean is hesitant to move, and doesn't know how to deal with the expected opposition of the non-professional staff to a body of professional librarians separate from them. There has been no general discussion of these issues.

Informal newsletter for library staff: How well does Library Matters work? There is a general perception that some areas contribute well, others not so well. Contributions in general are voluntary, and dependent on the initiative of individual staff.

Conduct regular and frequent staff meetings at all levels": "varying degrees of success" means that it would be necessary to ask staff what they think of the situation. Many would express dissatisfaction with the frequency and quality of meetings, with variations between divisions.

All staff should have access to voice mail and should receive training in its proper use: staff in Technical Services are concerned that they still do not have voice mail.

Create general manual for staff: does not exist, but administrative memos are being put on the Web.

In addition to the general recommendations from the CQI Team on Internal Communications, several subteams were formed later for more specific follow-up, such as the photoboard, recognition system, job exchange system. One was a subteam on staff communications, chaired by Irma Dillon.

They meet with the dean on Nov 6, 1997; he had not read the report and recommendations (document dated Oct. 17, 1997), so another meeting was scheduled for the next morning, Friday, Nov 7. Some decisions were made, and another meeting to present the document to LEC was set for the next Tuesday, Nov 11.

The dean stated that a librarians' assembly would be formed (as he did at other libraries when he became dean) when the promotion plan goes into effect.

Here is a summary of the status of their recommendations:
-Systematic development of staff e-mail reflectors: very limited action.
-Create Web-based staff information page (examples of contents listed): not being done systematically.
Staff information should include information on library organizations, including library governance, committees, teams, groups: although a list of library groups was prepared, and worked on my the dean's office, it has not yet been published. Jane Williams is responsible, and has said that it would be made available after the arrival of the webmaster (who has arrived). In the meantime the LEC has been reviewing the status of each group one by one at its meetings.

Note: in meetings with the dean and LEC the subteam also suggested that lists of staff languages, and subscriptions on listservs, be listed for staff sharing of information (as follow-up of previous effort by the Librarians Forum to create a directory of staff expertise; a project not supported by the Personnel office, after initial plans to support, and data forms were submitted by the staff).

-Staff suggestion system: because of the major cultural changes needed to implement a staff suggestion system, the subteam outlined its characteristics, some resources, and recommended that "the design and implementation of the actual system should be the responsibility of: the library managers, personnel staff, a newly established staff advisory council." No action has been taken, but the dean suggested that other ARL libraries be queried. He sent an e-mail query to listproc@cni.org on 11 Nov. 1998, asking "what might have already been done in other ARL libraries." No word as to whether he got any responses.

Heuristic note: a possible development related to a staff suggestion system is the development of a student suggestion system. In the past, Dr Harrar moved to implement a process in which a student advisory group would review suggestiions received in the lobby suggestion boxes. The possible value of student advisory group could be studied.
Reference:
Benefiel, Candace R., Wendi Arant, and Elaine Gass. "A New Dialogue: A Student Advisory Commitee in an Academic Library," Journal of Academic Librarianship 25:2 (March 1999), 111-113.
The experience reported here of Texas A&M University libraries is encouraging. They also sent librarians to student government meetings

Just before the summary in Library Matters came out, when the summary was probably in the dean's hands, he wrote the following in a memo to staff after the general meeting in August:
"we have implemented each and every recommendation and added a few." (email dated Aug. 21, 1998) This seemed in error, so one staff member (at least), Robert Merikangas, wrote him an email which included this message:

"As a member of the Subteam on Staff Communication, dealing with areas that were not implemented in the original report, I do not think that the recommendations in our report of Oct/Nov 1997 have all been implemented. Yes, some are being worked on (such as the list of staff committees), but much has not yet been addressed.

"Instead of general statements, I suggest we mount in a place visible to the staff a display of currently effective plans and recommendations, with the status of each provided. Such visual tracking has been found to be useful in other work worlds." (email dated August 25, 1998).

Merikangas received no response to this email. However, after this email, and another one sent to the consultant (Maureen Sullivan), with a copy to the dean, Merikangas was summoned to a meeting in the dean's office on Sept. 2, 1998, with the directors of Collection Management and Public Services also present. He was admonished for his communications and was given to understand that they were not welcome. The substance of his suggestions was not discussed.

After a meeting of the Arts and Humanities team on Sept. 10, with guest Trudi Hahn, manager of User Education, in which Merikangas and others raised issues about the user education program, Hahn complained about the meeting, singling out Merikangas in particular (perhaps she knew that he had been admonished). Merikangas was again summoned to a meeting, this time with the directors only, not the dean, and he was admonished again, in that he was not acting in ways communicated to him in the meeting with the dean. They did not like the "manner and spirit" in which he had raised issues. Merikangas disagreed with their interpretations, and noted that others at the team meeting had spoken first and raised exactly the same issues. At the end of the session, Merikangas asked them what they wanted him to do. The response was; "reflect on this meeting." His reflection was that the effort was being made to silence him. His further reflection was that very few staff would speak out in such an environment, supposedly one of "shared responsibility." Merikangas wrote up a report on this on Sept 17 and shared it with the team members.

See below for the later meeting of the dean with the teams on Sept. 22, 1998.

August 1998 general staff meeting: The LEC had decided in their May retreat to have a vision and organizational development program for staff in August, with Maureen Sullivan continuing as consultant.

The Libraries held "sessions on vision, values, leadership" in the Nyumburu Cultural Center and the Stamp Student Union on August 19-20, 1998. The facilitator was the consultant, Maureen Sullivan. She provided staff with an Association of Research Libraries publication, which included an article by Kathryn J. Deiss, "The Shared Leadership Principle: Creating Leaders throughout the Organization." The work made reference to the book by Robert Kelley, The Power of Followership, and Ira Chaleff's The Courageous Follower. A selected group of staff (about 50) met on August 19, and all staff were invited for the half-day session on August 20. The discussions led to lists of ideas on flip charts with post-it notes., which eventually were posted on the Libraries' web site.

In an email on Aug. 21 the dean announced the next steps that were decided by the LEC on Aug. 20.

- The flipchart sheets would be transcribed and distributed.
- A Strategic Plan Review Task Force would make recommendations by 1/31/99.
- A Work Culture Task Force would make recommendations by 12/15/98.
- Develop an interpersonal communications training program.
- Develop a work-redesign and process-improvement training during the Fall, 1998. "There are good techniques and tools to do thies (some in use already in the UM CQI training) and we must find ways to train staff in their use."

What has happened?

The flipcharts were posted.

There has been a training program in running meetings by a consultant brought from the dean's former institution, Carnegie-Mellon, and all staff were expected to attend the full-day programs. By spring 1999 almost all had done so, as individuals, not as teams or as those meeting together.

On Dec. 15, 1998, Lori Goetsch sent by email an outline "Training Program for Work in the New Organization" which had been sent before. The major categories in it were:

- working in teams
- leadership development
- managing in a changing environment
- other topics

Work Culture Task Force

The final recommendations of the Work Culture Task Force were published on the Web on Jan. 20, 1999. The managers and others will decide what to take action on. The major theme of the recommendations, and of many of the staff comments in the open forums, was accountability. Some points will highlight this.

The core recommendation is to establish a Library Staff Council, which would "construct a shared vision / share governance of Libraries with LEC".
There is no recommendation for a separate librarians' council, which has been asked for by librarians and promised by the dean.

The Staff Council should monitor the work culture, and evaluate the work of committees and programs involving staff. Staff should have leadership training. An ombuds officer should help staff who need to speak outside the structure.

A key process to be established: "develop and implement a process for the evaluation of Libraries' management" with 360 degree evaluations.

Note: in the LEC retreat of August 1997 the question of "upward feedback" was raised. From the summary:
Lowry provided samples of form to "rate your supervisor for upward feedback" which were used at Carnegie Mellon and stated that the process was found useful. These forms were summarized and the "feedback" was provided anonymously. Consensus of the LEC is to use the process on an experimental basis for LEC only. These evaluations will be separate from the merit and PRD processes and will be done at the end of the fiscal year. The experience will be used as a prototype to make a decison about the broader application of "upward feedback.
Post-retreat discussion led to a decision to proceed with the first "test" of "upward feedback" in September 1997 with consideration of broader application in 1998.
Staff heard that it was tried, but nothing further happened, so this is still on the agenda. 360 degree is clearly more comprehensive than "upward" only.

Some challenging statements from informal notes on the staff forums:
"Notice that we have not impplemented something like the 360 PRD. Top management is not accountable. We may have discussions with no real power. At George Washington libraries the staff group actually met with the dean, deliberated, made decisions. if we have a 360 system, then managers will be answerable for their decisions, and have to respond to staff criticisms. The key question: will the managers buy into it. If not, the system will be adversarial."

"Each division has its own personality. We need review of supervisors, are people given the tools they need. We need a venue for all to be accountable."

"We need to evaluate library management. Consultations on decisions have not been too wide. We need channels so that if we disagree with a decision we can do something."

"Concerning the evaluation of management, we have tried to bring it up. The merit committee of 1993 set up procedures for peer input, but that has been wiped out, so there is not even peer input now. We are two layers away from managers. Evaluation of managers is a good idea."

"This is one reason for the 360 degree system, so we can say when someone is not following the guidelines concerning the work culture. We need adult debates, not matters paternalistically dictated. The dean says we will change, but we need to be proactive."

Strategic Plan: this process is discussed more thoroughly below. At this point we note:

The update to the strategic plan in March 1999 was presented as a report and recommendations of the Strategic Planning Task Force, chaired by Jane Williams. [I have seen only the 2/11/99 draft]. Some of the main points:
-The goals dealing with undergraduate and graduate education were merged.
-"During the review of the plan it became evident that in addition to the recommendations for updates and additions to the Initiatives and their related goals there should be a mechanism established to assure on-going planning and evaluation." This would be an annual cycle.
The plan to have a Square One center and and Undergraduate Academic Center is dropped with no explanation.
The need to improve user programs with faculty is affirmed.
The attention to the need for duplicates is dropped.
Effects of partnerships with USM and CIRLA libraries are to be evaluated.
More storage space is needed.
Improve or merge EPSL and White libraries.
Improve or merge Art and Architecture libraries.

Major attention should be given to the team work re-design project with OD consultant Maureen Sullivan, since this has been the focus for moving into a new work environment.

On Aug. 30, 1998, Trudi Hahn, the manager of User Education, sent a memo to the teams indicating the assessment of librarian teaching sessions for each team for the general instruction classes in the fall semester. She had scheduled 95 sessions, 30 on Victor to be taught by volunteers, 65 each to be taught by 2 librarians, so 130 teaching units. Team quotas: A7H 42, SS 42, Science 48. The suggested rule of thumb was that each collection management librarian do 3 and each reference/instruction library do 6. The teams found it problematic that this whole plan and the quotas were given to them as directives. As one librarian put it: "I think that subject specialized instruction based on the subject specialists' collaboration with the departmental faculty is being ignored in favor of Trudi's generic instruction sessions for lower division students and additional desk work. I have ac opy of Charles' message to the deans in regard to the reorganization in which he claims that 'a primary goal of the teams is improved liaison services to faculty and students for the purposes of collection development and reference and instructional services.' That is not not what is happening." (memo Sept. 9, 1998)

The Arts and Humanities team invited Trudi Hahn to meet with them on Sept. 10, 1998, and they raised their concerns with her. They agreed to do the program as outlined, "with Trudi's agreement to heed our input/suggestions at the end of the semester."

One team member (Merikangas) was brought in to a confrontation by directors, based on Hahn's complaint of the issues raised at the meeting. He reported on this session in a memo to the team. (see elsewhere for details). She also complained about what she saw as a bias against her in the minutes issued by the team in an email.

Teams requested student support. For example, A&H requested 40 hours per week. It became clear over the fall and spring semesters that no funds would be allocated for support staff for the teams.

The teams prepared for the all-teams meeting on Sept. 22. For example, the A&H team identified their concerns:

decision making: what is our role as a team? do we carry out decisions or do we have a voice/input as a team?

our priorities: what are they?

keeping a balance: role as subject specialist, responsibilities to the departments - how do we balance these with our new team responsibilities?

communication: initial assignments: team felt that communication was in one direction

Sept. 22, 1998: meeting of team members with Dean Charles Lowry and directors Lori Goetsch and Desider Vikor. This meeting was "to discuss issues, questions, concerns, etc. that have surfaced as we've moved into the team and matrix environment." (Goetsch email, Sept. 16, 1998). Earlier Goetsch had stated to the PS managers: "There are fundamental issues we had hoped to reckon with earlier on but that timing did not allow. This meeting is an effort to catch up on discussions we should have held earlier."

A number of librarians entered this meeting with a wait-and-see attitude, not sure whether the top managers were open to hearing real concerns.

The meeting began with a statement by the dean.

After some silence, the Humanities team presented their concerns on flipcharts. Some questions they posed: what is our role in the big picture? are we decision makers or not? Do we develop or just carry out programs?

The dean: I call "collegial" what we are, in some measure. Priorities? Work 55 hours a week. It will be a juggling act this year. I have no sage advice.

Much of the discussion was on means of evaluation.

Then a question: Do team members have any power? We were told to do the classes. The first day of the vision workshop was by a hand-picked group. What kind of message is this? What do we do as professional librarians?

Dean (interrupting): We try to engage as many as possible in the decision making process.

A message stated in a number of ways by the directors: work things out, cut some slack, we are just getting started.

The dean said his job was to get the resources.

It was noted that librarians in Special Collections wanted to know how they would relate to the teams.

The dean expressed a willingness to meet again with the librarians, but it was pointed out that there is no regular forum. He stated: this is a critical thing. We need to build librarians collectively into participating in governance. The normal way is to have a forum like a faculty departmental meeting. We need to begin to make a start to meet the basic university requirement for a plan of governance. We don't have one. Now that we have the promotion plan in place, we need to have this on the agenda.

A librarian noted: You should know the perception of team members: that orders are coming down to us, and we have to deal with it. We are supposed to have trust in what the managers are telling us.

Goetsch stressed the work redesign process, with journals to keep track of time, and different work load balances for different individuals.

Note: there was no follow-up meeting with the dean at the end of the semester.

In October the team members prepared PRD expectations using boiler-plate outlines for each of their job responsibility areas.

On October 2, 1998, the team members were told of a planned meeting with Maureen Sullivan, and that each would be asked to fill out a questionnaire, the Individual-Team-Organization (ITO) survey. The self-scoring instrument was to be mailed to Maureen. by October 16. It was also stated: “We are assuming that everyone will have completed the PRD expectation-setting process that covers the next six months and, in the context of that process, will have reviewed the libraries' mission and goals.”

On October 19, 1998, Robert Merikangas sent an email to Lori Goetsch, re: the work redesign process.

“You ask for questions and concerns:
We are organized with the label ‘teams’ -- but I don't see the teamwork situation. Teams are usually project teams or work group teams -- the first design a project for operations, the second actually do operations as a team (design, evaluate, improve, get support, etc.) - We are not set up to work on ongoing operations as a team - not the operation of Service Plus Information and Research Center (no ongoing organization or team at all), not user education with departments and core courses, not the bais work of working with colleges and departments and interdisciplinary programs.

There are a number of service activities which librarians might be involved in:
-display and exhibit program
-making the Web site into a true gateway
-evaluating and deciding on the role of PS memo serives (are they still in effect and development?)
-follow-up on the incompletes in the CQI Internal Communication recommendations
-use of ongoing statistics
-general promotion of book reading, in cooperation with the Terrapin Reading Society and others

We could be talking about the formation and bylaws of the new librarian council, announced as forthcoming by the dean.

We could be looking at the design of a knowledge management system to share our professional expertise.

We could advise the LEC as they develop the recommended staff suggestion system (see LEC agenda).

How will we give feedback on the quality and operatio of the PRD process, which replaces, without consulting us, the one developed with peer involvement in McKeldin Reference?

How will we give feedback, both formative and summative, on the performance of managers, to them directly and to those to whom they report? Should we develop our own instruments and procedures? I have a draft form, and have requested the campus draft from Marvin Pyles.

In general: how will we link the individual job outlines to:
    library systems and programs
    ways to improve our systems and programs?

When will we see the annual reports for this past year?

How will we evaluate the performance of our consultant, Maureen Sullivan, and give her feedback?"

She responded:
"Thanks Bob -- I concur with many of your concerns and ideas for areas where we need dialog and resolution. We have a long way to go to make our organization a truly collaborative one. The various development activities that Maureen will work on with us over the next year will go a long way to help us in

that regard. I'm sure you can appreciate that we are at the very beginning stages of this process -- only two months! -- and we have much work ahead of us."

(Goetsch had seen Sullivan deal with work redesign at a Solinet program several years ago and has confidence in her.)

A meeting was held on October 23, 1998. The flipchart transcriptions on the work redesign activities were distributed and the teams were asked to discuss the barriers and supports, especially, that were listed. The next steps were to be to:

  review mission, goals, and service philsophy
  agree on primary customers
  clarify values
  determine basic/essential services
  align activities with work culture and strategic planning groups

The work was to be continued with Sullivan on Dec. 4.

At the very end of the meeting a list of librarian activities was made and the question was asked: do the teams as teams have anything to do with these?

  work at the service desk
  collection management
  user education
  liaison work with faculty
  library service, committees
  university service
  professional service
  (circulation and reserve services were excluded, although these are done in branch libraries, and to some extent at McKeldin service desk)

There was no agreed-on answer.
Librarians do these things, but not as teams and it seemed that the teams have no control or role in any goal setting or monitoring of these activities. The teams apparently will be involved in deciding the balance for each activity for each librarian.
It was also asked: how do the teams relate to the work of the branch libraries? Will the teams have any clerical support?

On Nov. 4, 1998, Robert Merikangas asked about a report on the questionnaire results. Lori Goetsch replied: Maureen's working on it between various travel commitments, but will send results to me as soon as she has them completed. There was no report until a summary was posted on flip charts at the Dec. 4 meeting.

A meeting of the teams with Maureen Sullivan was held on Dec. 4, 1998.

A summary of the results of the ITO survey were posted on flipcharts, and the survey totals for each item were given (n=25). Sullivan called attention to the following as showing the need for attention (there has been no publicized attention since that time). The ones needing attention showed a pattern of some entries under occasionally, seldom, or almost never.

Individual

5 I receive the recognition I deserve

7 I know in plenty of time when anyting important happens

13 I am supported in using unique and different approaches to problem solving

14In this organization failures are forgiven rather than being held against people forever

Team

24 My team's meetings help me to get my job done

26 The members of my team have clear ways to resolve our differences

28 My team has clear and effective decision-making procedures

32 The quality of my team's output is more important than any deadlines the members have to meet

33 My team's recommendations are given thoughtful consideration by management

34 The solutions that my team offers to management are implemented

Organization

37 My organization takes planning seriously

38 The planning we do here is useful.

39 This organization has the flexibility needed for changing conditions and career growth

40 The reporting system and accountability channels here run smoothly and effectively

42 Our company regulations make sense and support my work

46 People in this organization function so they avoid crises and having to "put out fires"

47 I am able to take time to sit back and get a broader perspective on my work

48 Work lows easily here with no excessive delays

49 This organization can provide the resources needed to get the job done

50 This organization has a significant impact on its professional field and/or its marketplace

She noted especially 33,34.

Sullivan asked: any comments? any suprises?

After some silence, one comment: it is hard to answer about teams, we are not really working as teams.

Some of the comments made in the course of the discussions:

-we are "drowning in managers"

-we are now "pseudo-teams"

The discussions on primary customers and values were inconclusive.

A main point made by Sullivan: we need to change because of the danger of losing the patronage of our users to other services. The universities have competition from corporate universities.
There was no evaluation of the session.
It was not clear why the teams did not get the ITO survey summary in advance.
The basic problems raised at the last meeting were not carried over to this meeting.
It seemed that the team members are to relate to the managers dealing with reference, collection management, and user education by having parts of their PRDs done by them.

The next meeting was Jan. 22, 1999. See the following report:

Workshop on Becoming a Team
Facilitator: Maureen Sullivan
Jan. 22, 1999

Participants: members of three teams

Notes by Bob Merikangas, with focus on problem concerns expressed by team members. Replies and comments by Maureen Sullivan are not included, since she could not deal with the issues. She said she would bring our concerns to management.
-Our work has often been done as individuals, how do we move to work more cooperatively?
-We have developed expectations in the departments we work with.
-We are evaluated in PRD and for promotion as individuals: will those systems change?
-Will the organization support this move to teams?
-McKeldin Reference worked as a team in many ways, with many commonalities. Now we are out of touch, and missing much of the old cooperation. We are struggling.
-There is no forum for dealing with the larger, organization-wide issues.
-The team in the Performing Arts Library is still there and working.
-Those in the branches are in two different systems. For the branches this is an additional work setting.
-McKeldin as a center has been disbanded, but our customers see the same setting.
-Branch librarians see teams as another layer. Branch heads are working as a team.
-Arts and Humanities team members see each other only every two weeks.
-We worked like a team as bibliographers.
-We have no common goals.

-The teams are not involved in or responsible for our individual work in: reference, BI, collection development. However, we do contribute time to some user education courses.
-The expectations of individuals are different in McKeldin and in the branches. Example: working weekends and evenings, doing circulation. We have such different duties, how can we fit together, and be a group? How do we transcend the different physical places?
-What are our collective work products?
-Are we now saying that individuals will not be rewarded for their expertise, their specialness? It is scary to merge into a team if that is lost.
-Since a major question is how the teams relate to the larger systems, how do we review how that relationship is working or not working?
-What seems to be missing is an infusion of vision. We try to be open, and read, but where is the new vision? In the management team?
-What we are doing is at the behest of others. For example, our work on the general user ed classes is imposed.
-What does this team have to say about BI, reference, collection development?
-What is our purpose? We don't know. What product?
-There seems to be an inherent problem: we work in different areas. We can talk generally about better ways to do things, but can't really change. Someone from Performing Arts can't select in architecture.
-It seems our only common purpose now is to share information and communicate. The round robin is helpful.
-Branch heads are already working as a team.
-There may be a danger in working as a team that team pressure will be to make us conform, a kind of brainwashing.
-Exercise: draft a mission statement. Crux of the problem: we don't have one.
-What are we going to do with work redesign?

Some final comments:
-We don't have the autonomy to be flexible: who does more of what and how we can help each other. Things come from above.
-Our responsibilities have been distributed.
-We are called "teams" but we are in a pyramid power structure. All comes from above, we can make no decisions.
-We are not empowered.
-The major problems are the conflicts in the pyramids, how to deal with management, not how to deal with each other.

As a follow-up to this meeting, Robert Merikangas took advantage of his exit interview with the dean to make a number of related points. Then on Feb. 3, 1999, he sent copies of the above notes to the dean and to Yelena Luckert, manager of the Arts and Humanities Team. He also suggested to the dean that he and the team members read the article by Chris Argyris (referenced elsewhere in this document), "The Emperor's New Clothes."

The exit interview was the first one carried out in the dean's new practice. He said it is his intention to have an exit interview with all professional staff personally. The conversation was almost an hour and a half. It is not known whether the dean referred the information obtained in the exit interview to others in the library management or to the personnel office.

The general situation in April 1999:

The teams were continuing the project of discussing their work activities, with the view, in the eyes of some, of reducing the number of types of activities for which they are responsible.

The members of the teams were recording their activities in time logs for a two-week period, so that the total time spent in their various activities could be documented. The amount of work (production, learning, items processed, transactions, etc.) accomplished in the time intervals was not being recorded.

The time of year and semester was not typical of busy times, since most library instruction was over for the semester and book orders for the fiscal year had been completed by March. In some cases weeding of the reference collection had also been completed earlier.

The activities will presumably be coded into categories, but not necessarily organized into systems.

Directors Vikor and Goetsch met with the Social Sciences team, and listened to their concerns about their roles. Why were they formed into teams? what are the roles and responsibilities of the teams as teams? These were the questions which had been raised in the meetings with Maureen Sullivan, but now they were addressed directly to the directors. The idea that librarians working at the service desk in McKeldin might get together was floated.

Summative evaluative comments on team members performance in library instruction by the manager of User Education were relayed to them by the team managers. These comments were apparently constructed without observation of the teaching performance of the librarians and judgments of their attitudes were formed without conversations with them.

My observations on the situations of the teams:
The thrust and pressure of "reengineering" or re-design of the work is now on the professional librarians and their many tasks. This repeats the process outlined by James Champy and others, which began by putting the burden for flexibility on the knowledge workers, with the threat of losing their jobs if they did not find ways to make their work competitive. Librarians are told that

corporations may replace their work in the non-profit libraries if they do not change. In the business world this approach often did not work, and Champy and others moved on to the more difficult step, which apparently should take priority, reengineering management. It is the top managers and next the middle managers that need to be reengineered. See Champy's Rengineering Management. ("Reengineering is in trouble").
Champy emphasizes the need for trust. Easier to say than to achieve.

For further insights into the connections between general catchwords and what actually happens, see:
Robbins, Harvey, and MIchael Finley. Why Change Doesn't Work: Why Initiatives Go Wrong and How to Try Again - And Succeed. Princeton, NJ: Peterson's, 1996.
From page one:
"Think about your own job experiences and the changes you have been asked to make in the past few years -- TQM, reengineering, restructuring, etc. We're guessing some of these initiatives were modestly successful, a few were total flops, and the rest fell into some vague, plus-minus pile in between. None quite measured up to expectations, though -- right?"

All managers and all workers agree there is nothing wrong with missions, values, redesign, change, quality -- they are all wonderful. The question is: what actually happens? What does the help of the wise consultant actually accomplish? What will the situation be like in a year or two? Another vision conference? another consultant?

HEURISTICS

It would seem, based on the past history of library management, that the primary need is to be able to distinguish between the rhetoric and the reality of shared governance. This should not be a surprise, since this need is present in all political situations and all bureaucratic settings.

Here are offered some particularly useful resources for creating heuristic approaches concerning the rhetoric and reality of shared governance.

Argyris, Chris. "Empowerment: The Emperor's New Clothes," Harvard Business Review (May-June 1998), 98-105.
This brief article draws on the author's long experience of working with companies and helping them distinguish from what they say and what they do, sometimes called the espoused theory and the theory in practice. It gives us questions and terminology help us to distinguish rhetoric from reality.

"The change programs and practices we employ are full of inner contradictions that cripple innovation, motivation, and drive. At the same time, CEOs [deans] subtly undermine empowerment. Managers love empowerment in theory, but the command-and-control model is what they trust and know best. For their part, employees are often ambivalent about empowerment -- it is great as long as they anre not held personally accountable. Even the change professionals often stifle empowerment." (p. 98)

The usual procedure is to draft a vision, work out a strategic plan, define work roles and processes, and define individual job requirements and expectations. This is what is being done in the libraries, with each team member having complex PRDs based on the collection of job responsibilities. Then the expectation is that they will work as professionals and be empowered and innovative. However, as Argyris points out:

"Yet the process is so riddled with inner contradictions that change programs that follow it will only end up creating confusion, particularly at the implementation stage." (p. 101)

The mixed message is this "do your own thing -- the way we tell you." Having these visions and strategies and structures and goals drafted by task forces does not mean that they engender internal commitment to those not on the task forces. They are imposed, and seen as imposed.

The use of recognition awards and the employee of the month, the quarter, the year awards in various categories, which the libraries are now doing, does not work in the long run, and "all that has been created is more external commitment." (p. 103)

What about bringing in a change professional, as the libraries have brought in Maureen Sullivan? She reports to the dean, and no evaluation forms are used to give the staff the opportunity to give feedback on her performance. Argyris: "In their own way, however, the vast majority of change professionals actually inhibit empowerment in organizations." (p. 103)

"In the end, everyone is frustrated. In theory, empowerment should make it easier for organizations to meet their numbers. But when change programs are imposed without recognizing the limitations of empowerment and when managers and employees are not helped to deal effectively and openly with them, the organization ends up worse off than it was to begin with. Empowerment too often enters the realm of political correctness, which means that no one can say what he or she is thinking: this is just nonsense. In this scenario, if you challenge the change agent, you become an enemy of change." (p. 104)

From Argyris we learn some ways to look for contradictions and try to bring them out into the open.

One librarian, whose name is withheld to protect the innocent, after reading it, commented that "it was frighteningly accurate."

But what if we cannot be open?

One of the major reasons why change programs are often not what they claim and what they seem to be is that staff live in fear. As one librarian put it, why speak out: I'd get my head bitten off again. Life without a head is no fun. In addition to the usual questions about morale, the friendly observer would do well to ask about the level and forms of fear in an organization, specifically in our subject locus, the libraries.

The books on "driving fear out of the workplace" could be quite useful in raising questions. See:

Ryan, Kathleen D., and Daniel K. Oestreich. Driving Fear out of the Workplace: Creating the High-trust, High-performance Organization. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.

"In order to help their organizations accomplish needed changes and help people past their fears, leaders must create open workplaces where everyone can be candid about his or her experiences, concerns, ideas, and hopes. An open, trusting environment is the essential antidote to mixed-up times when ways and old expectations no longer work." (p. xxi)

Who are these leaders? Anyone in the organization.

This study is my hazard at being candid. Good luck to me.

An excellent book to encourage all staff to speak up is:

Chaleff, Ira. The Courageous Follower: Standing Up To and For Our Leaders. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 1995.

This author is in this area, and could be used as a consultant. He does workshops for organizations.

The directors of the library divisions are key actors in the management system, since the dean works directly with them and not with their staff. Their peformance as managers affects the daily operations and work culture more than the statements of the dean. A fully detailed history would record and interpret their activities and identify the modes of accountability for their work. Unfortunately, it is not feasible to do this in the space of this study. However, each division should set up the means for recording its own managerial history, and articulate agreed-on judgments of accountability, and also the minority judgments.

The cutting edge of change to a new work culture and matrix management is supposed to be the new teams, so we need to ask about them, but first it would be well to clarify the general work setting.

What actions are being taken to implement the Internal Communication recommendations, including those of the Subteam on Staff Communications?

Specifically, what structures are being created for shared governance by staff in accordance with a faculty model for librarians and the general academic model on the campus? Has a set of by-laws been submitted to the ERG Commitee of the College Park Senate for approval and filing? The assumption here is that the Libraries want to be considered and treated as an "academic unit" since they report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, have a dean who is on the deans council, and have librarians claiming "quasi-faculty" status (although on many other campuses the librarians have full faculty status).

The Libraries have created a committee of librarians to recommend librarians for promotion in the new rank structure (librarians 1,2,3,4) and permanent status [similar to tenure]. How well is this doing its job?

Related to this promotion process is the availability of funds to give the librarians the raises needed for both the promotions (when they are in fact promotions, and not merely placement in the new ranks) and for equity based on librarian salaries in the area for similar institutions. The personnel office, Ray Foster, has generated data to show the need for market-based adjustments, and the dean has used these, it is understood, in requesting increased funds for librarian lines.

Note the campus expectations for shared governance bodies, from the campus Plan of Organization (some terminology added in brackets):
"Each college, school, department and other academic unit (hereafter the word unit refers to college, school, department, and other academic unit) shall have a plan of organization that conforms to the University Plan of Organization, that provides for the establishment of a [elected] Faculty [Librarian] Advisory Committee, and that embodies shared governance principles and relevant University policies such as the policies on Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion and merit pay."

The Plan of Organization of each department and college shall provide for a unit-wide assembly. This assembly shall include faculty [librarians], staff, and students [student workers]. All faculty [librarians] in the unit shall be members. Staff and student [worker] members shall be in such numbers, and selected through such methods, that each Plan shall specify."

Note that the role of the Library Council is unique, and should be included in some way in the Libraries' Plan of Organization.

"The Plan of Organization of each college, and any revisions thereto, shall be filed with the Senate for approval or disapproval. . . . Each department's Plan of Organization will be attached to the College Plan of Organization to be submitted to the Senate."

Governance has many modes and moods, such as the following: how are they working?

management and its structure, changes in organization
sources of leadership, modes of followership
innovations: what new happens
role of plans and objectives: meaningful?
strategic plans: special role?
use of task forces
use of TQM/CQI terminology, methods
use of focus group terminology, methods
nature of accountability in each setting and instance
honesty of PR, reports, internal and external
learning by mistakes?

How is the professional knowledge, in the professional literature and in persons, being brought to bear?

is it?
what use is being made of knowledge management systems?

At the present time, there seems to be little or no expertise in knowledge management in the Libraries, although the departed reference librarian Robert Merikangas was investigating the literature, and has a bibliography. He recommended the use of knowledge management in a memo to Jane Williams, director of Planning and Administrative Services.

For a good general overview:

O'Dell, Carla, and C. Jackson Grayson, Jr. If We Only Knew What We Know: The Transfer of Internal Knowledge and Best Practice. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1998.

A lecture by Patricia S. Foy (Director, Knowledge Services, Pricewaterhouse Coopers) on knowledge management was held by CLIS on campus on April 26, 1999, perhaps raising awareness.

Now a potential resource within possible access of the Libraries will be the new course being designed by Dr Claude Walston, LBSC 708(?), to be offered fall 1999. Draft course description: The nature, acquisition, use of knowledge. The strategic role of knowledge in organizations and institutions. The information and knowledge ecology. The structure and function of knowledge management systems and the role of intranetss and the Internet. Knowledge as intellectual capital. The roles of librarians and information professionals in the knowledge economy. Strategic issues and future trends.

A paper that gives an overview that could stimulate questions:
Verkasao, Matti, and Pentti Lappalained. "A Method of Measuring the Efficiency of the Knowledge Utilization Process, " IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, 45:4 (November 1998), 414-423.

The literature on how professionals use the research in their own professional literature is sparse, with some of the best of it on nursing practice. We need in librarianship many studies on the practicality of our studies, such as the apparently quantitative user needs studies and the potentially more useful qualitative studies. See the editorial by Donald Riggs, "Let us stop apologizing for qualitative research" in C&RL News ---

How does the quality movement, specficially the Continuous Quality Improvement activity on this campus, contribute to effective shared governance?

As indicated in the library management history, the CQI model has been used in a number of instances. The campus is still using the terminology for several campus-wide task forces loooking at the quality of life. These task forces have used the role of facilitator and some other meeting-process methods for their work. Does any of this represent either a commitment to or the authentic implementation of Total Quality Management or another full version of the quality movement? or, more specifically, has it led to effective involvement of the staff in ongoing improvement?

In order to answer these questions, we would have to, first, match what has been done with the best practices in the quality movement. A resource for this might be:
Beckford, John. Quality: A Critical Introduction. New York: Routledge, 1998. This text gives many resources and also critical comments on them.

Those who have studied quality movement have observed that the campus projects have not really incorporated the key elements, such as systems approaches and real measurements (as opposed to opinion surveys). There has been no public evaluation in the Libraries of what has been done, but many hve noted that task forces have produced recommendations for someone else to implement, and there has been little or no implementation. This is not a CQI process.

We have reached the stage in the quality movement in which it is possible to ask what works and what doesn't and why. A good recent summary is:

Cole, Robert E. "Learning from the Quality Movement: What Did and Didn't Happen and Why?" California Management Review 41:1 (Fall 1998), 43-

Cole gives useful analyses which could be used by the Libraries and the campus to reflect on what is going on. However, there is no indication in the Libraries that any serious effort for the use of CQI is planned, so perhaps there are no questions.

For a more complete treatment, see:

Cole, Robert E. Managing Quality Fads: How American Business Learned to Play the Quality Game. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

We need to create a heuristic framework for dialogue about major library programs.
Here is a beginning:

D. The current dynamics of the programs in a library organization: How do we form judgments? What do we want to measure?

Before plunging into the complexities, we might offer some generalizations about what the change drivers have been in recent years:

the technological driver: the move to more electronic resources, which has put the materials budget under pressure, with the need to cancel print resources, and the need for more workstations to provide access (there are far too few workstations in the libraries now; new libraries being opened now have hundreds of workstations). Many of the ongoing problems, as for the whole campus, involve the lag in technical support.

the budget driver: with the increasing gap between what is needed and what is allocated for materials and staff, the move to consolidate positions and collections have been the top priority, even as hopes develop for new staff positions. The primary action has been phasing out Hornbake Library as a separate library, making the space available eventually for collections now in McKeldin, thus giving space in McKeldin for the already crowded collections

the space need driver: as indicated, the libraries have run out of space, and new to weed collections, move McKeldin collections to Hornbake, and find off-site storage facilities.

the lack of sufficient professional subject librarians driver: the effort to have two subject specialists for every discipline on campus, one a bibliographer for collection development, and one a reference librarian for reference and instruction, was not funded, so had to be given up finally (especially since the directors of the two relevant divisions could not work out any time-sharing agreements, or any agreements). It was decided to merge the roles and form three subject teams. Details are given under the history of the subject team project, but it should be noted that there was no necessary connection between merging the roles and thus providing new job descriptions and the particular organizational structure created, and the decision to call the new structure a "team" structure. Creating three units called teams has resulted in fragmenting the cooperative structure for those librarians in McKeldin, and cut them off from any governance role with reference service, library instruction, and the reference collection, all of which they were formerly responsible for. Priority has been given to campus department-linked collection development, but even the collection development governance has been fragmented. Other connections which are needed, such as connections between government documents and all subjects, have yet to be formed, and are not facilitated by the separate-team structure with the government documents unit outside the structure.

Our setting: given the collections: print and electronic libraries, the thrust is:
Providing access--
    the automated library: providing ease of use of the cataloging
    the instructional /teaching library: providing sessions and
        instructional aids to help users be self-directed searchers and
        retrievers of information and documents
    the helping library: providing timely assistance for users
Note:
-the more transparently easy the use of indexing and locational information, the less need for instruction and reference assistance
-the more effective the instructional material and services, the more the users and do their own searching and finding, the less they need to ask for specific help
-the more effective and instructional each helping transaction, the less often the users will have to come back for similar assistance

Sum: indexing, instructing, helping -- ways to organize access and the paths for using the access routes.

The collections and services which a library is able to offer at any time is based on a dynamic situation, the interactions between the levels of funding and the changing decisions on the levels of each area of service. Decisions on trade-offs are made constantly: therefore the main judgment questions deal with the quality of the decisions in relation to the agreed-on goals of the library. But: who is involved in reaching the agreed-on goals?

Here is a brief outline of a framework for level of service decision making:

A. Whose needs and wants will be met? Whose expectations? This needs to be addressed systematically.

Many library users and satisficers, they will be satisfied with whatever is available, because they are short-term oriented and are not aware of their capability to influence library services. Others, usually a small number, are maximizers, who will ask for more than is immediately available. Part of the picture is that libraries can offer many services if few know about them or take advantage of them, or, on the other hand, if users find that services are not available (such as no seats to study or no free workstations to use), they will leave and so the apparent demand will drop.

"There seems to be some very real [!] evidence that users learn to feel happy with the library system they have. They may have had expectations originally which were far in excess of what was perceived as being delivered. They learn, however, to adjust. Subsequently there is little or no impetus in the educational-library system for change. Those who are in positions of power to influence the library budget decisions are often those who are relatively infrequent information-seekers. We can also cautiously suggest that those wo are relatively casual users of the library will perhaps tend to have favourable attitudes toward it. Such satisfied expectations, such little scope for dissonance, will often ensure that a given level of funding persists." (Oldman & Wills, p. 157)

See:

Buckland, Michael. Library Services in Theory and Context. 2nd ed. New York: Pergamon Press, 1988.

Oldman, Christine, and Gordon Wills. The Beneficial Library. Bradford, Eng.: MCB Books, 1977.

Taylor, Robert S. Value-Added Processes in Information Systems. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1986.

Service level agreements: One of the ways being actively developed to create a match between services provided by a library and the fair expectations of potential library users is the negotiated service level agreement. As the level of funding varies from one year to the next, and the campus priorities are developed and clarified, what service levels will be chosen?

expand number of hours of service, or length of time available for each service transaction?

librarians do search, or coach searching?

deliver materials, or user picks them up?

new collection items or funds to preserve items for future generations?

librarian time for novices, to teach them the basics, or time for advanced researchers, to coach them in complex strategies?

general scripted workshops open to all, or specialized sessions for particular sets of research needs?

serials or monographs?

print or electronic?
free printing or pay-for-printing?

Reference:
Pantry, Sheila, and Peter Griffiths. The Complete Guide to Preparing and Implementing Service Level Agreements. London: Library Association Pub., 1997.

A chapter by Jean Steward, "Service Level Agreements and Performance Indicators," in a recent book, is being tracked for a complete citation.

A service level agreement will assume, perhaps, that attention is being paid to cost effectiveness of library services. But what if the library has a high overhead for operations, in terms of staff or other expenses, and so it not able to put money where there is the greatest need? Could materials be purchased at higher discounts? are processing expenses too hig, because of low productivity by the staff, either untrained or poorly supervised? Are too many staff lines dedicated to inefficient support activities and not enough to essential workflow activities?

One of the major innovations in recent years that would enable libraries and similar organizations to get the control over their services that they do not have now is activity-based costing. In these systems, which can be computer-based, the cost of various projects as brought to completion can be measured, and then judgments made in relation to the benchmarks of best practices. The first library to do this well might well become world famous. However, the move to simple program budgeting seems to be impossible at this time.
See:
Hicks, Douglas T. Actitity-Based Costing: Making It Work for Small and Mid-Sized Companies. 2nd ed. New York: Wiley, 1999.
Kiel, L. Douglas. "Implementing a Microcomputer-based work Reporting and Monitoring System for Government Services: A Case Study," Journal of End-User Computing, 5:1 (1993), 18-26.
Kiel, L. Douglas. Managing Chaos and Complexity in Govermnment: A New Paradigm for Managing Change, Innovation, and Organizational Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994.
For an example of this approach being applied, see:
Ellis-Newman, Jennifer, and Peter Robinson. "The Cost of Library Services: Activity-based Costing in an Australian Academic Library," The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 24:5 (Sept. 1998), 373-379.

Another way to approach the efficiency question is in terms of knowledge worker productivity. Librarians often object that they have to spend much of their time on clerical tasks, such as looking up books in a catalog or filling out transfer forms for individual volumes, changing toner cartridges, etc. The

McKeldin Library, the new teams have been assigned no funds for support staff, so clerical work in support of bibliographical work (whether for collection development, creating bibliographies, doing HTML mark-up) must be done by the librarians. In the current work re-design process, the consultant seems to be saying that we will no longer distinuish professional knowledge worker work from technical and clerical (non-professional) work, so everyone must not only know how to everything but actually do it. From my perspective, ending the distinction between professional work and other work destroys the integrity of professional work and limits its productivity (and also certainly ends any rationale for differences in salary). In this situation there are only well-paid managers and everyone else, with higher salaries going to information system technicians (who need no academic knowledge).
For an overview of this situation, see:
Drucker, Peter F. "Knowledge-Worker Productivity: The Biggest Challenge," California Managment Review 41:2 (Winter 1999), 79-94.
One of the examples used by Drucker is that of nurses, who had to define their key tasks and limit the support work that they had been forced to do, so that they could be true health professionals and colleagues of the doctors instead of their subordinates. Librarians may have something to learn from the nurses, as well as from the physicians, who are finding their professional scope under pressure also, from administrators.

Another major issue is the one of manager productivity: what do they do with their time? Seeing the manager as an activity center, what is produced? Perhaps the position is not necessary at all. Perhaps a level or specific position of middle management could be eliminated. If the main purpose of a position is to facilitate the work of others, then the question is how well is this done.

The key factor in these methods: the nature and the results of the activity must be defined and measured, not merely how much time was spent on it. For example, how many guides of what complexity (requiring what level of knowledge) did a librarian produce in how much time spent in guide-making activities (and, of course, how good are they?)?
The LCSH: activity-based costing.

One way to set the context for the examination of the quality of library performance is to outline a typical search process by a library user, and see what questions for investigation are generated. This approach is often called one of asking about output measures, what outputs are achieved in response to users' needs.

1. User goes to library to find material on a topic, to write a paper.
    -how clear are the signs, the visible information on how to search and to locate the material?

-what instruction on using the libraries was available to the user, in relation to their status: College Park student, University College student, Maryland citizen, etc.? (see User Education below)

-what assistance was available and used in the Libraries? How good was it? (see Reference assistance below)

-how effective is the search strategy actually used? For a full picture of the available strategy models, see works by Thomas Mann.

2. User has list of items wanted from searches of bibliographies and catalogs: how many of those wanted are obtained? Which are obtained locally and which from other sources?

3. There are many factors involved in a successful output, the user getting what is wanted. Taking a list of wanted items, it would be possible to investigate the reasons for success or lack of success by inquiring into the following, as a beginning, based on a book example:

-did user find the item in the catalog?

if not, was it there and not found, or not found because of lack of search skills?

were there any errors in the catalog which hindered the search?

was the item owned, but lost or missing?

was the item owned, but not in the catalog?

-if the item was not owned and so not in the catalog, did the user obtain holdings information for another library? and request it -- place hold or place ILL request?

-if the item was not owned, should it have been, based on the collection policy? if it was held by another UM library, should College Park have it also, or not, based on the collection policy?

-if the item was not owned, do the Libraries want to know it was wanted? did the user report it as needed?

-if the item was in the catalog, but checked out, did the user know how to place a hold and obtain it?

-if the item was in the catalog and not checked out, or in a non-circulating collection, did the user locate it and obtain it?

-if not, why not?

-user did not go to the correct location

-item was near the right location, but not in exact place because there was no room to shelve it

-item was in overflow location because there was no room at the correct location

-item was temporarily in a secondary location (reserve, reference, etc.)

-item was correctly labeled but not on the shelf in the correct location

-item was mislabeled and in that wrong location

-item was in the library but not shelved

-item was discovered to be missing after a search

4. If the item wanted is an article in a journal, then the situation is complicated, because the journal may exist in an electronic version or electronic delivery systems somewhere. Factors affecting successful output would include these:

-if the journal is online as part of the Libraries holdings, is it cataloged? if not, how is the user helped to locate it?

-if the journal is online, how does the user find the article? is it fulltext? graphics? (what parts of the journal are online, which not?)

-if the journal is online but not part of the Libraries listed holdings, how does the user find it?

-if the journal/article is available by document delivery system (such as UcCover), how does the user know of its availability and how to have it delivered?

So the general question is: when users wants articles that is available to them online in some version, how often do they discover this and actually obtain it, in what time frame? of these occasions, how many involve paying a fee for either viewing or obtaining a copy of the article? Further, in how many occasions does the user make a good judgment as to try to obtain the article by free or paid online or delivery access or by ILL?

5. If the item was not available from the Libraries' print or electronic systems, was the user able to get it from another source? How effectively did the Libraries help in this process?

From this sequence, we break out the major program systems in the Libraries for detailed attention:

Collections
Cataloging of the collection
Library cooperative networks
Spaces, shelving, and facilities
Web threshold of the Libraries
User Education
Reference services and other assistance

There are a number of recent books published by the American Library Association on evaluation of library services. Are the Libraries checking them to see what is most useful for their purposes?

Collections:

The general purpose of building the collections is to support anticipated future use, but there are many issues and necessary trade-offs in making decisions on what to spend funds on and what to accept as gifts.

Some of the current issues and activities may be used to illustrate the complexity of the situation and to provide a beginning approach to oversight of the collection development process. Until recently the director of Collection Management and Special Collections apparently made all the basic decisions, probably in consulation with the dean, but now others are being involved. Who might be involved?
-librarians responsible for selecting materials
-academic department library liaisons (they are gathered for a meeting on extremely rare occasions)
-others?
Some major issues:
-the allocation of the materials budget: division into categories such as serials and monographs, foreign materials and domestic, approval books and specific orders, use of standing orders and publisher orders, electronic and print/nonprint, current and retrospective (including replacements), general materials and special collections (with likely low usage, only by specialists), the various subjects, reference materials and circulating materials. A committee, the new Collection Management and Resource Allocation Committee (and also the related Electronic Resources Committee) started in fall 1998 to develop formulas for allocating the budget, something that had never been done. It was announced that " a major effort will be launched in the coming year to examine the fund allocation process and structure of the materials budget. The result of this effort will be the development of an explicit rationale for the allocation of library materials funds." (Vikor 10 June 1998)The formula will involve variables in four general categories: publishing, departmental activity, departmental excellence, and library use.

-obtaining more funds for materials: although in the current fiscal year of 1998-1999 there was $1,250,000 added to the base materials budget, this did not result in any money for really new material, such as books or periodicals. 92% of it went to cover increased serials costs (inflation), so it was not necessary to cancel periodicals as in previous years. However, various print serials were cancelled to allow for the purchase of electronic serials. The balance of the money went: $20,000 to provide for free delivery to faculty of articles from UnCover, $20,000 for preservation replacement, with the balance of about $55,000 as discretionary funds.

Some specific issues:

-the performance of the BNA approval plan: librarians always have to monitor the performance delivery of the approval plans, because the Libraries are so dependent on them for obtaining currently published books promptly. In 1998 a major failure of performance by BNA occurred. By the summer it was apparent to Acquisitions and to selectors that the weekly shipments were much smaller than usual, often only one-half of what they should be. Desider Vikor knew of this, and shared the BNA problem with selected librarians, but not all selectors, apparently because he did not want to have the information reach the faculty, who would have been concerned, especially those who have been critical of approval plans. Some information came from Acquisitions, who even put a notice of the increased size of shipments in Library Matters of October 30, 1998. They, for the first time, reported that "we were seeing small shipments of about 120-140 books total." Some other librarians began discussing the problem, wondering whether it would be necessary to spend their book funds to get the missing books. Finally a message was sent to selectors by Karla Hahn on Dec. 15, 1998. Karla said Blackwell admitted not placing orders with some publishers from May on. She reported that "Blackwell has been very aggressive in dealing with this problem. People have been fired, their organization has ben reshaped, and they tell us that they have ordered all the items they missed earlier." She indicated the need to monitor the performance of the approval plan closely.

This experience leads to the need to ask about such performance in a systematic fashion.

-replacing print periodicals with electronic texts: When databases with so-called "fulltext" periodicals are provided, a major question is whether the print subscriptions should be continued. The general judgment of the library world is that electronic "fulltext" is not really fulltext, and often is made available quite a length of time after the print issue is published. In addition, the abstracts by the vendors are not done by subject experts, and do not provide the good access of the databases from professional associations. Primary periodicals, especially those with graphics and advertisements which are of value, should be kept in print, it seems. How are the libraries doing with this issue? When the Libraries subscribed to the Ebsco general periodical database, now called Academic Search (not catalogued yet), a number of general periodicals, held in Hornbake Library, were cancelled by Desider Vikor. When I began evaluating the fulltext, and asking for a list of all those cancelled, Desider also investigated, and came to a new decision:

"I have reviewed again [implying he had reviewed them before] some of the recent hbk periodical cancellations and have decided to reinstate some of the titles, based on a closer examination of what is actually available to us full-text via EBSCOhost." (message of 10 March 1998). This meant that there were gaps to be filled in a number of titles. In effect, we had to refer patrons to public libraries or elsewhere for these titles, including: America, American Family Physician, Behavioral Health Management, Christian Century, Christianity Today, Commonweal, Education, Health, Inc., Psychology Today, World Press Review. Some stayed cancelled, such as Mother Jones, Whole Earth Review.

-obtaining new periodicals: Plans are being made in the spring of 1999 to deal with possible new money for adding new periodicals without canceling any. "New subject monies MAY be forthcoming that will enable you [selectors] to order some new journals for your departments." (Harvey memo 3/11/99) Money may also be used to add a backrun to a journal. What may continue to be a major problem is ordering new general titles, such as the following not held:

American Prospect
Baffler
DoubleTake
Futures Research Quarterly
In Context
Journal of Excellence in Teaching
Public Citizen
Red Herring
The Responsive Community
To Improve the Academy

-the amount of resources to allocate to special programs, such as in support of the Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities (which has received a matching grant of $410,000 from NEH). It will be housed in the basement of McKeldin Library. The space formerly allocated to the Electronic Reading Room has been taken away, and a few of the workstations are in McKeldin Reference.

-maintaining possession of materials, such as erotica and high-use books, which are vulnerable to theft and need extra protection. A plan is supposed to be adopted.

-weeding the collections: policies and practices, and reports

-collecting materials not in support of specific programs on campus, such as law and medicine (a study in support of a revised law collection policy is being done in spring 1999 by a CLIS student, under the direction of Diane Harvey

-general reading, such as current fiction: what will be the successor to the General Reading Collection (originally the paperback recreational reading collection)?

The gifts-in-kind policy is clearly stated to donors: the Libraries reserve the right to sell or otherwise dispose of materials which are donated and which are judged not needed. A general question: how many (what percentage) of the donated materials are judged worth adding to the collections, and what does it cost to add them?

Cataloging of the collection:

the main questions are: how adequate are the functionalities of the online catalog, and what percentage of the various parts of the collections are catalogued?

-The process for getting bids on a new automated catalog (new ILS) for the USM libraries who collaborate has started. Who will be the new Victor? What will replace the Carl system? What have the libraries learned from the delivery performance and non-delivery of Carl? Lists of desired features have been prepared, with input from librarians. Have faculty and students been asked? who will make the decisions on the successful proposal from which vendor?

-What is not cataloged? The catalog does not clearly state which of the collections are in the catalog and which are not: why is this not stated up-front, rather than the vague, general advisory which was offered on VICTOR if you read the right screen, that not all is included? Types of materials not cataloged: what percentage of each? what is the present plan for adding cataloging?

-archival material: some is cataloged, but most is not.

-books: most are cataloged, but there is a backlog of gift books not yet cataloged. On order books are not in the catalog (as they are for UMBC). Some sets of monographs, such as the Patrologia Latina, do not have each volume cataloged, so individual authors cannot be searched.

-chapters of books: some contents notes are shown, but in general chapters are not cataloged.

-electronic databases: many, including some on subscription for years, are not cataloged (such as the FirstSearch databases). The Libraries do lists of titles (often cryptic) with little information, such as usually not including the date range.

-electronic fulltext journals: individual subscriptions are usually cataloged, but sets in large databases are not catalogued (such as Ebscohost Academic Search titles, Lexis Nexis Academic Universe titles). Users must consult print or online lists to see which are available.

-government publications: US documents are in the catalog from 1991, with plans to add the file back to 1976 (which they would have to be edited and corrected to show our actual holdings and locations). This would leave the titles from before 1976.

-libraries on campus: the holdings of the CLIS Wasserman library are in the catalog, but not the holdings (including datasets) of other departmental libraries.

-maps: most not in the catalog.

-microform sets: many are not in the catalog, but new records are being purchased and added as funds permit.

-miscellaneous collections: various vertical file collections and other uncataloged collections (such as manuals and directories) are maintained in library locations.

-photographs: most not cataloged

-technical reports (EPSL over 1,500,000, ERIC over 400,000): not in the catalog.

Web threshold of the Libraries

The first Web Board set up the initial Libraries WEb presence, and left suggestions for the continuation and development of the site. It was always understood that the Board would not do all the work, but would monitor for quality and procedures. What has been a continuing question and remains a question is whether there will be a coordinated development of the Web site. They main dialogue on this issue seems to be between the Web Board and the dean, since there has not been any general staff meeting about the Web site since the final report of the establishing board. There was a Web Council created, as a way of sharing some information from the Web Board and units with a Web presence, but that group does not meet and has no role in any decision making. Until there is some kind of general meeting, it is difficult to reach any judgments about what is happening and what directions should be taken. One reason for delay was the expectation that there would be a webmaster position filled at some point, and that was finally done at the beginning of 1999.

It would be worthwhile to go back to the "future goals" from the Web Editorial Board of July 26, 1996, and see what has been done and might be added to present goals. Examples:

-test the Web sites' interface and navigation with focus groups

-provide an e-mail reflector for WebSpinner users and other staff interested in Web site development

-establish ad hoc groups to develop areas with cross-divisional interest (such as the Faculty Guide)

HEURISTICS

Here we will list some of the issues that have arisen that might be addressed under some kind of structure of shared governance. As a basis, the roles and responsibilities of the following should be discussed and put on paper (or Web):

-Web editorial board
-webmaster
-library management forums
-units and teams
-individual librarians and other staff

Furthermore, ways to evaluate the ease of use and effectiveness of the Web pages could be developed. What statistics should be taken (this is a national question for libraries)?

Making the Web site a form of gateway for library users, which would guide them and help them make choices about which resources to be used. It would be question-based rather than directory or library-service based.

This kind of approach seems to be implied by the recommendations of the CQI Team on Undergraduate Library Services in the 21st Century that the Libraries focus on three thresholds, the electronic, the physical, the pedagogical.

What is the electronic? "It will exploit the diffuse network of electronic resources increasingly available to provide remote access to the services of the library. Our recommendations urge that the library's efforts concentrate on developing electronic resources that are characterized by their ease of use and the richness of their content in guiding students into library collections." Some examples given:

from PAC to floor maps for locations

typical staff-student interactions with branching techniques to supplement personal assistance

guides for particular courses and assignments as well as subject guides

links from PAC to electronic resources

Who will be accountable for developing the ease of use and the means to guide students into the collections?

Now, many of the electronic resources are neither cataloged nor described in ways that would help students know why and when to use them. For example: a link to "MdUSA" is not all that clear as to what it is and what it is for.

Some libraries, such as Ohio State, have developed gateway systems.

Home page: the Web Board, in consultation with the dean, has changed the layout of the home page several times.

Subject pages: beginning in 1999, efforts are being made to bring together Web resources by subject as well as by library or unit. This will allow connections with departments and courses to be given a clear location. These "scholarly resources on the World Wide Web" will not, however, be the easy to use guide needed for undergraduates.

Faculty guide: the first Web Board recommended that a faculty guide, not just brief information for new faculty, be created, and they gave an outline of what it might look like. Some reference librarians supported the idea, but the Web Board did not take any action.

Hosting other organizations: A policy was finally reached by the Web Board in consultation with the dean, that organizations connected with the Libraries could apply for location on the Libraries site. This came about after it was discovered that a member of the Web Board had installed a not-visible site for a section of the American Society for Information Science on the Libraries' site without any awareness or permission of the Web Board. The person was asked to remove the pages, and finally did so after many months.

Collaboration with Academic Information Technology Services: Both the Libraries and AITS have instructional material and links to resources on their pages. When there was an article in Outlook about books on the Web, based on the work of the Inform staff and the Reading Room they have developed, some library staff felt that the situation was not presented well, and that the links provided by the Libraries were more authoritative. Perhaps there needs to be a way for collaboration between Inform and other AITS services and the Libraries to be developed.

Search capability: This was recommended in 1996, and has recently been added, as the campus has added search capability to its pages.

Library staff pages: There have been a number of recommendations for systematic development of pages for the use of staff, expecially from the subteam on staff communications.

Library cooperative networks

No library has everything. Each library has a responsibility to help its users to find material that is located elsewhere, and to help the user obtain it if the user need not or cannot travel to the other location to use the materials.

The Libraries cooperate with a number of groups, such as:

- USM libraries for shared LIMS and shared subscriptions to databases
  - the library directors have found it difficult to work out cooperative collection development arrangements
- St Mary's College for specific cooperative arrangements
- Maryland interlibrary loan arrangements
- general interlibrary loan systems
- OCLC for shared cataloging
- PALINET for shared access to OCLC services
- Center for Research Libraries for access to their collections
- Chesapeake Information and Research Library Alliance (CIRLA)
- Association of Research Libraries for materials and services

A detailed history would include the dealings with these groups, and with those such as Research Libraries Group (RLG) in which the Libraries formerly held membership. What have been the costs? the benefits?

Spaces, shelving, and facilities

The last year or so has been major changes in space use and plans for further changes. The major problems of lack of shelf space and lack of student seating space are not yet resolved. The Space Planning Task Force was set up and presented its plan, which is in the process of being implemented, but it is dependent on the availability of funds.

The transformation of Hornbake Library is taking place, and the staff of Special Collections are preparing for their eventual move to Hornbake. They were not significantly involved in the plans, it seems, but are involved in working out the details for offices and collection spaces.

Brief notice of some specific issues which have developed:

The shelving problem:
Space for the collections: What is the present space situation, for the collections, for individual and group study, for computer workstations, and for staff? There is no room for the growth of the collections now, although McKeldin will have more room when the special collections are moved into the renovated Hornbake Library. In the meantime, and for the foreseeable future, storage space will be needed. When will the storage space be available?

The public lounge in McKeldin was closed. It happened suddenly. The staff were not clear on the decision process.

The National Association of Black Journalists were given space (former group study) on 4m for archives storage; no announcement to staff or campus (not put on floor plan until 1999)
What is the status of various campus offices with space in the library? what is the arrangement?
For example: the Gompers Papers

The Judaica Reading Room: the room was created, then closed, apparently for lack of funds. The staff were not told what was going on. The room was labelled, put on floor plan, books have been cataloged and shelfed. When the room was removed later, no information was given to the staff.

The Humanities Electronics Text Center will be created as a part of the implementation of the grant received to create the MITH, Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities. Space will be provided in the basement of McKeldin as part of the Libraries' contribution. Candidates for director (campus faculty members from the College of Arts and Humanities) were interviewed in May 1999

HEURISTICS

What is the status of the implementation of the Space plan?

The process of stack maintenance includes the following: when are they being done?
    stack inventory (not done for many years)
    withdrawal of lost items, replacement when indicated by policy (no current policy or action?)
    stack weeding by subject librarians (not being done or planned?)

stack removal to storage, based on history of use (this is in process, by labelling books for possible removal with slips, based on last circulation date)

Note: the process of weeding and transferring the Hornbake reference collection has been completed, and the circulating collection will be done. In the meantime the Hornbake stacks are closed, and must be paged from another library. There is no room in McKeldin for the Hornbake books that should be transferred there.

User education

HISTORY: User Education as a program

The major calls for the development of a systematic user education program have come from the instruction team and the CQI team on undergraduate services. In addition, the reference librarians in McKeldin called for such a program before the unit was dissolved and replaced by the teams.

Such programs would be collaborative with faculty and others. The need for such collaboration is clearly stated in the recommendations of the CQI Team report, Undergraduate Library Services in the 21st Century. Note the recommendations to the faculty as well as to librarians in this well-presented report.

One key point: "Instructors will increasingly need librarians to assist in mastering available resources on the subjects of their courses, to assist in enriching classroom presentation, and assist in designing assignments that fold new sources of information into their students' learning. In turn, librarians evaluating material and preparing specific aids to subject matters will increasingly require the knowledge of the faculty in evaluating the quality of resources. The result will be a fuller and more interactive relationship between librarians and the faculty." (end of Section 1)

Recommendation 5 is, recognize the increasing mutual dependence of librarians and faculty in the information age. Note the action recommendation:
"We recommend that faculty become proactive in bringing advances in library resources to their undergraduates:

- Working with librarians, faculty should proactively engage new products introduced into the library that enhance learning in their areas of specialization. Faculty should work with the products to know their potential and limitations and should introduce their students to such advancements as a major objective of their teaching.

- Consultation with librarians should be a normal activity in preparing a course, including working together to develop assignments that require studens to employ library resources.
- Faculty and librarians should jointly develop subject guides to enhance undergraduate students' access to the faculty member's area of expertise."

With recommendation 10, strengthen cooperative relationships between faculty and librarians, a number of specific actions are listed as examples.

What has happened in recent years?

In general, the manager of User Education Services, Dr Trudi Hahn, has resisted suggestions for a general program coordinated by her position. Instead, she has focused on the development of introductory workshops and seminars or specific electronic resources for faculty and graduate students. She has also recently participated in the development of UNIV 101, but apparently as her own project, without sharing that project with others involved in user education, such a subject team librarians.

One apparent move toward a general approach was the needs assessment project of Trudi Hahn, designed in connections with a CLIS course, LBSC 601, Library User Needs,with instructor Diane Barlow (spring 1997). The project was to have library school students interview history department and life sciences faculty and students about their needs for user education. This project was not coordinated with the reference librarians working with the history department, and their impression from subsequent information was that of significant lack of competence of the CLIS students doing the interviews. The results not integrated into McKeldin's work. The plan is to have a Public Services forum on the project was announced, but never done.

The involvement of CLIS in general campus information literacy has been an issue and a possiblity for several years, since CLIS led in the development, by Marilyn White, of a 3-credit course on information literacy (no longer offered). Dean Ann Prentice submitted a proposal to the campus for funding an information literacy project, and began work of designing a training/education program by hiring a graduate student. Trudi Hahn was somewhat disturbed that this was being done without any collaboration with the Libraries and recalled the previous collaboration with the Libraries and the Computer Science Center in designing LBSC general information literacy course, taught as one section for several semesters by Dr Marilyn White. When she protested, she was told that she would be an adviser for course development; but work began without consulting her. Work began in spring 1997, and was continuing in the summer 1997, when the new provost withdrew the $15,000 funding. It was announced that a committee in fall 1997 would plan a general information literacy program for entering students, with a key role by the Undergraduate Dean, Robert Hampton. It is not clear what will happen with this more general campus initiative. In any case, it seems to deal with basic competencies with computers, and not with a full library competency program.

How might a general program, led by the Libraries, be governed? Trudi Hahn has stated that the Public Services Committee, then the PS managers, is the proper coordinating group. However, those managers, are not involved, and have paid little attention, merely receiving Hahn's reports. Also, such a group does not include those in Special Collections actively doing user education. Finally, beginning on Dec. 4, 1998, Hahn created new coordinating group, the first since the former library instruction committee led by then coordinator, Rebecca Jackson. This new group is CLUE, Committee on Library User Education. Members:

Trudi Hahn, Manager, User Education Services
Maggie Cunningham, librarian in User Education Services
Paula Greenwell, library technician, McKeldin Periodicals
Karen Fishman, librarian with Library of American Broadcasting
Bob Kackley, reference librarian, EPSL
Bob Garber, Social Sciences team (temporary position)
Carleton Jackson, Nonprint Media Services
Pat Herron, Humanities team
(Mary Winker, library technician,was a member then resigned)

The only one of this group with both significant experience and present responsibility for course-related library instruction is Pat Herron.

The agenda of this group seems to be concern for the present programs handled by the User Education unit, such as the workshops and English composition courses. The method for evaluation of library instructors is being discussed, and an assessment instrument was drafted.

A major question is how such a group can deal with the issues of concern to librarians. The difficulty of using "representatives" instead of involving all librarians is seen in this extract from the minutes of the Social Sciences team meeting, Dec. 16, 1998 (minutes dated Dec. 21):

"Bob Garber, the team's representative, reported on the committee's first meeting. Topics covered at the meeting included the spring class schedule and evaluation of teaching. Much discussion ensued about Bob's role as the team's representative. The team would like to provide Bob with feedback to take back to the committee. The team particularly would like more information about how the spring class schedule is being constructed (e.g. on what basis are the number and mix of classes determined?) in order to be able to provide useful input and feedback, and they would like more input into the evaluation process for teaching. Specifically, team members requested that the evaluation process be a growth and learning opportunity for librarians, and that the process focus on substance rather than style. Bob G. will take these concerns back to CLUE."

With the creation of the subject teams, the relation of the librarians in the teams to the general workshops scheduled by Hahn became an issue. Each team was directed to supply instructors for a quota of sessions. This became a controversial issue, since the librarians were being expected to teach sessions in which they had no say. Each session was supposed to have two librarians. Librarians asked:

-what determined the number and scheduling of sessions?
-who designed the goals and methods of the sessions?

As a result of a meeting of the Arts and Humanities Team with Hahn in which general questions were raised about the general workshops, one of the team members was brought to a meeting with top managers and told that Hahn had complained about such questions being asked, when only the assignment of the librarians was expected to be discussed. This process made clear that the librarians were expected to fill the assigned slots as directed, without raising questions about the general program.

HEURISTICS

We should note that the campus has an important resource in the development of assessment instruments:
The ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation, 1129 Shriver Lab.
Phone: (301) 405-7449.
The clearinghouse answers questions and loans from its documents collection. Many resources are on its Web site: http://ericae.net

The User Education unit has taken responsibility for offering workshops to the campus and for coordinating cooperative library instruction with the general programs:

student orientation programs (First Look Fair, graduate student orientation)
new faculty general orientation programs
EDCP orientation courses
Freshman composition courses
Junior composition courses
introductory communication (speech) courses
selected other introductory courses (such as JOUR 201)

In general, these are courses previously handled by the librarians in Hornbake Library.

The new emphasis has been on offering workshops instead of course-related instruction, with the focus on specific database skills, which seems to be more of a training model rather than an educational model. The literature on user education seems to recommend a more concept-based program. Also, the training model could perhaps be delivered more efficiently by online tutorials.

In spring 1999 the CLUE group began efforts to coordinate the library part of the ENGL 101 courses with the TA's teaching those courses.

The instruction for the professional writing courses has historically been course-specific, determined by collaboration between the assigned librarian and the instructor. The general goal was to orient the students to the organization of the professional literature, such as that of the disciplines, or the particular literature (specifically business medical, legal literature those courses). McKeldin librarians have retained responsibility for the legal and medical literature courses, but not all instructors have worked with them. In one case of extensive collaboration, Bob Merikangas (McKeldin) and Norma Procopiow worked out instruction, exercises, and in-library activities, and collaborated on Norma's textbook, The Elements of Legal Prose, published in 1999. In recent semesters the libraries have offered the sessions of "When is Your Paper Due?" for professional writing classes instead of sessions on the literature. This session teaches searching of a FirstSearch database, Social Science Abstracts, and some coaching by the pair of instructors in databases selected by students attending. It does not teach general conceptual methods of database searching, and does not teach the professional literature generally. When a former Hornbake librarian, Deborah Mauro, offered to teach the traditional general sessions, she was told this was no longer allowed, by the manager of User Education Services.

The CQI team on undergraduate services noted: "Students typically avail themselves of information literacy programs only when such programs are directly associated with a course in which they are enrolled." The effort is being made to associate the workshops by requiring students to attend a workshop and obtain a certificate of attendance, but this is not a very close association with the actual course.

Assessment of these general courses and sessions would presumably focus on:
percentage of target students reached by programs
learning outcomes for students in relation to goals

In addition, a general information literacy or library instruction program would include program goals and implementation steps in relation to the following:
connections to regional secondary school information literacy
connections to regional community college information literacy (especially for those who will transfer to College Park)
a general (even state-wide, as in the California State system) information literacy/competence program
programs for CORE program, majors, interdisciplinary studies
programs for graduate programs
programs for faculty (new faculty, new courses, ongoing work)

programs for administrators (legal work, educational planning, obtaining data for tenure and budgeting decisions. etc.)

programs for campus staff

Note: in previous years library instruction objectives for most (not all) of these categories were documented, but no coordinated programs were developed. Implementation was left to the initiatives of individual librarians.

In particular, the "Goals and Objectives for 1996-97" listed 6 major goals and 23 objectives under them, but many of them have not re-appeared in later discussions. They could be used now for the beginning of general planning of user education.

One area in particular which needs systematic attention is the policy and practice for librarians to teach library skill courses on campus, outside the library school. Some examples so far:
-Lily Griner and Pat Herron teaching a one-credit course on Latin American resources for the Latin American studies certificate program. The decision of the Libraries to support this teaching by allocating work time by the these librarians has apparently been modified. if one-credit sections are added to courses, how will they be funded and supported?
-Trudi Hahn was involved in teaching UNIV 101, the new World course. Was this her personal project, or part of a general program? On work time? Salary paid or not? A report on the course experience was provided at the campus Teaching with Technology Conference, April 30, 1999,

Note: the McKeldin reference librarians documented a proposal for such a general program, but were not successful in bringing to library-wide conversation.

By "program," is meant the existence of a situation in which conversations could be held on: what we are trying to do, whom are we working with, what is being done, how many are we reaching, what is being accomplished, what are people learning, etc. How is this year better or worse than last year? Statistics which only show numbers of class sessions and number of attendees (and do not compare specific settings over time) are not sufficient for these conversations.

There are a number of specific forms of collaboration between faculty and librarians recommended that could be monitored. Examples:

-the design of course assignments

-the development of subject guides

What are the "best practices" for these activities? Are there any practices at all?

The best process for moving into systematic collaboration is not clear. Exhortations to faculty in general may be be the most effective method. This would be similar to general exhortations to improve teaching. Great numbers of faculty do not participate in the programs offered by the Center for Teaching Excellence or the listserv offered by CTE. An occasional library-related program by CTE would not have (and has not had) a great impact.

One way found in the literature to move things along is the designation of faculty outreach librarians, or even giving librarians offices or office hours in department office areas. See:

Stebelman, Scott, and others. "Improving LIbrary Relations with Faculty and University Administrators: The Role of the Faculty Outreach Librarian," College & Research Libraries 60,2 (March 1999), 121-130.

The report from Gelman Library at George Washington University is co-authored by Jack Siggins, University Librarian, formerly head of Public Services at Maryland, and husband of the present consultant, Maureen Sullivan. He might be available to share his wisdom with this campus.

The governance of such a comprehensive program might be in the hands of a coordinating committee composed of: subject team managers (one to be the chair, on a rotating basis), manager of User Education Services, a librarian active in user education from Collection Management and Special Collections.

Reference services and other assistance

We will focus on the assistance to users provided at service desk, particularly the service desk on the first floor of McKeldin, the desk which is designed to be the service point for the beginning user who needs to know where to start and the person who has a specific question. Referrals are made from this point to other locations and other service points. Assistance is given to those using the workstations (VICTOR catalog, specific CD ROM files, specific reference workstations, and general reference workstations) and the reference collection and its subcollections (ready reference, quick reference, reference reserve, ARS shelves, Taking Sides collection, alcoves with shelves and index tables, and the nearby national bibliography collections.

Let us think of the service being provided by a community of practice.

For an overview of the connections between a community of practice and the continual learning need to carry on and improve that practice, see:

Wenger, Etienne. Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity. new York: Cambridge University Press, 1998

In 1998 major changes were made.

The problem situation: It was understood for years that it was no longer feasible to continue Hornbake Library as a separate place for undergraduates. (Many undergraduate libraries around the country had already been closed, such as Michigan State, and Ohio State was soon to close its undergraduate library.) The collections and services would have to be integrated into the main library, McKeldin. The collections had not been fully supported for years, so students often began in Hornbake, getting assistance in planning a search, but then had to move to McKeldin or another library for more search specialized sites or for the actual materials. It had been decided years ago that Hornbake could only claim to support lower level courses, with general indexes, general periodicals (all "professional and scholarly" titles, that usually duplicated those in McKeldin, were cancelled by 1987), and general books. It was not possible, it seemed, for the director of libraries to make such a major decision, so it was not until the Library Council set up a campus-wide committee to make the decision that it could be done. The intention was that the change should be seen and accepted as an improvement of services to undergraduates (and presumably no loss of services to graduate students and faculty), not a loss because of the loss of the separate site and spaces.

The key point: it is highly desirable that undergraduates move as quickly as possible to advanced research skills and the use of discipline-based materials, government documents, all relevant databases, and to the use of interdisciplinary approaches. This movement from novice user (with a good basis from advanced work in secondary school, we hope) to advanced user should be facilitated by the setting and visual signs, the self-instructional materials, the course-integrated skills learning, and good reference assistance.

The clear challenge was to integrate two libraries, create new service sites, and create a flexible and integrated support system for undergraduates, without taking away to one-on-one service and liaison work with advanced researchers and the faculty as teaching partners. The Klumpp report, summarized below, called on the Libraries *and the faculty* to do all of this and raise the general level of collaborative work for the undergraduates in the face of the increasing complexity of libraries and electronic resources.

One problem, not left unnoticed, is that few, whether librarians or faculty, have the broad and up-to-date knowledge to go highly efficient research in many fields these days. At most, many become experts in one or two fields or types of materials, and few become real generalists.

Services and Space Planning Task Forces were formed. They held hearings, met with some units, set up a web site, issued documents early in 1998.

July 3, 1997: A memo from the dean of libraries on the "Hornbake/McK Reference Amalgamation"
Dean Lowry indicated that Square One should be in the background of the discussions on reference, with options kept open. He wanted longer hours of reference service, particularly 8 am to 10 pm.

August 1997: McKeldin Reference prepared and discussed a plan for services after the merger of Hornbake and McKeldin reference services.

Meanwhile, Hornbake Reference librarians started working in McKeldin, Sept 1997. Sue Baughman remained head of Hornbake librarians until the end of Nov 1997; then she remained in Hornbake to supervise the move of Periodicals to McKeldin.

April 1998: Public Services Managers Group began to meet. The committee to select people for the new positions in the reorganized Public Services was announced.

May 7, 1998: Library Personnel Office announced a change in arrangements: instead of appointments, they would be internal searches by the general search committee for the positions of McKeldin Public Services manager (new), Branch Services manager (changed), and Access Services manager (new). It had been announced previously that the positions would be held by Sue Baughman (contract employee), Neal Kaske (head of EPSL, head of Branch libraries), and Terry Sayler (head of ILL). It later developed that the same people were selected by the internal search process.

May 18, 1998: Sue Baughman (coordinator for the design of the new Service Plus site) tells librarian Barbara Lay in a conversation that she has been expecting librarians to be discussing plans for Service Plus. Barbara told her that the librarians had seen no point in doing so since they see others handling the implementation, and suggested that Sue meet with the reference librarians is she wanted to communicate with them.

May 1998: Library Executive Committee (LEC) held a planning retreat. Summary of results reported to staff in a memo on June 11, 1998. Provost and dean met with staff on May 27, 1998, primarily about the budget. At the retreat the LEC decided to develop a shared leadership phiulosophy statement, and to have an organizational development and team-building program for all staff in August with Maureen Sullivan as facilitator. The topic of how the measure how we are doing was addressed, with the intention of using the first year of Service Plus "as baselie for future data comparison." Most of the meeting dealt with budgets.

May 21, 1998: a Design Forum was held to discuss re-design of instruction rooms, the ERR, and Service Plus desk area. Many questions were raised, not answered.

May 28, 1998: McKeldin Reference met to discuss plans for Service Plus, with Sue Baughman present. Pat Herron presented a diagram for the desk and additional workstation arrangement.

June 4, 1998: McKeldin Reference and others met to discuss Service Plus planning. Lori Goetsch stated that no acting coordinator would be named for Service Plus because a coordinator would be named in time.

It was learned that no additional workstations for instruction would be available, so Pat Herron's plan could not be implemented until further notice. In July the walls were taken down, and workstations arranged. It was eventually decided (by someone) that signs would have to be put on the workstations indicating that they were reserved for use by those working with the library staff, since students were just sitting down at them for their work. I say "by someone" since there was no forum in which to discuss such questions until Jan 1999.

July 6, 1998: deadline for librarians to identify the subject areas they wanted to work with on a specific subject team. Team and subject assignments were announced in letters August 4, 1998. The teams were formed and moved into new offices. A memo to the campus dated Sept. 3 told of the team reorganization. The titles to be used by the librarians with the new combined responsibilities were not clarified.

Summer of 1998: New physical arrangements are implemented, and discussion sessions are held.

July 20, 1998: A memo was sent entitled "Thoughts on Service Plus" by Daniel Dollar, a CLIS graduate student who had been working in the reference area and participating in the discussions. By the Thursday Group he means those gathering at what had been the McKeldin Reference meeting time, but was then an expanded group with no clear identity.

His message:
"Before I depart on my vacation, I am going to share my thoughts on the development of Service Plus and the duties and responsibilities for those who work there. NOTE, you may want to print this message, it is a long one.

I believe that management needs to set the groundrules for the duties and responsibilities of student assistants, graduate assistants, staff and librarians. These duties not only include working on the desk, but also others duties that are expected when thes personnel are not working in the Service Plus area.

We need guidance on how the mix of personnel will change at the desk during the day, and does that affect the duties of those working in the Service Plus area. For example, if there are no librarians working after 7 pm does that change what is expected from the personnel who remain until closing time.

I am concerned that we cannot reach policies needed in our Thursday Group meetings for several reasons. First, we have widely varying views of what duties need to be done by whom, and no clear mission statement to resolve these views. An example, some librarians believe adding printer paper is not a good use of their time, while other librarians may not mind doing such tasks. Neither one of these viewpoints is wrong, but someone needs to say clearly what are reasonable librarian duties. Second, the amount of policy making that needs to be done cannot be accomplished in the limited time frame of one 2 hour meeting each week. Third, student assistants (graduate and undergraduate) have little voice in these Thursday meetings, but they are going to carry a heavy load for staffing the Service Plus desk. Do we need their participation so that they can buy into new opportunities/responsibilities created by Service Plus? Fourth, some of the conversations taking place in the Thursday Group appear to be causing hurt feelings among participants, which cannot help in furthering the goals of group cohesion in the new Service Plus world. Finally, I do not know what the objectives of the Thursday Group are suppose [sic] to be -- are there questions we must answer and deadlines we must meet?

It is not that management decisions world [sic] be better than decisions reached by the Thursday Group, but management had [sic] the authority to set clear boundaries of staff duties. if everyone clearly understands what is expected of them and their fellow employees, we can get on with the details of making Service Plus work for the University community. Plus, it is going to take time to develop these duties/policies and there is not much time left before Prime Time this fall. We can muddle through, but I am concerned that chaos in the Service Plus area will affect our ability to work together to meet client's needs.

A mild example of the chaos: An individual who was not supposed to be on the desk told me that they had to stay on there while the librarian was trying to help a client in the reference stacks. The person who was asked to stay at the desk told me they had to stay at the desk because Librarian X was a stickler about keeping the desk covered. Thus, a staffing decision resulted not from clear policy, but from the preferences of a given librarian. This is not about the rightness or wrongness of the librarian's views; this simply is an example of a lack of policy and clear lines of responsibility. (I want to stress the event just described may or may not have happened, the lack of policy is the issue here.)

Without clear duties and responsibilities, I may at one hour be with staff on the desk who view me as a colleague and then the next with a change of staff. I may be seen as subservient because of my position as a graduate assistant. So I leae the desk in the first hour to help a client, then the next hour I am questioned for leaving the desk. Such a situation would affect my morale and waste my energy that should be directed towards clients because different individuals define my role based on their perceptions, rather than clear policy.

An example of my duties on the Service Plus desk could be that my primary responsibility was to cover the desk and answer to a given librarian or staff member on duty, with a a secondary duty that if two other student assistants were present I could rove as needed.

We had a clear vision about removing the wall separating the reference consultation and the information desk, but what is the vision to unify these areas? I don't believe we have a mission statement guiding us or goals tp suppport that mission or strategies and policies to reach the goals. This is a source of concern for me. I truly don't know what telling the student assistants that they are "less-desk-bound" means.

The Thursday Group is an excellent forum for putting meat on the bones of Service Plus. Service Plus provides the opportunity for innovation and better service to our clients. But without strong involvement from all levels in the library, I see us running the risk of interpersonal tensions, lack of mission direction, unclear duties and non-existant [sic] policies leading to conflicts that damage the Service Plus idea beyond repair, while we are trying to evaluate it during the fall.

In closing, let me cast my vote for professional development for the students and staff. Do we get to be apart [sic] of the subject teams that are forming? The ideas that came forth last Thursday for on-going training and mentoring of the student assistants are great ideas. I also support the wearing of name tags that state our positions -- librarian, staff, student assistants. This allows clients to participate in appropriate role definition of library staff.

I am sorry for the very long message, although a job description is done for student assistants and a Service Plus manager will soon be hired, I still have these overall concerns for what we are trying to do and a need to share them.

Daniel Dollar"

July 22, 1998: A subsequent very important memo by email was sent to those involved with the Service Plus desk by Sue Baughman (new head of Public Services) and Paula Hayes (former head of McKeldin Reference). The situation, as indicated in Dollar's memo, was that many questions about roles and policies had been raised in meetings, but not answered, and there seemed to be no forum in which decisions could be made. Questions were raised about the draft job description for graduate student assistants and not answered. The following memo seems to indicate the setting in which the service is still operating, since the questions raised were never answered and not yet discussed (to my knowledge; and certainly not by Feb. 1, 1999).

"Dear Colleagues

We are writing in response to some of the concerns with have been expressed by a number of you, and which are most likely shared by many. Some of these concerns relate to the feelings and attitudes which are being expressed at our meetings, and to the purpose/progress of these meetings. Others relate more directly to what is actually happening at the Service Plus desk. We have, discussed these issues and would like to share our thoughts.

First of all, we encourage your feedback and communication; it is vital that issues are identified and brought forth rather than being allowed to fester. That being said, we will not always have the answer, in fact, in many cases, there is no answer. We are all in the beginning stages of the process to devise those answers. Some of the important players are still not involved, and, therefore, the process is an especially slow, laborious, and often frustrating one. The primary purpose of our weekly meetings at this point is to keep the channels of communication open and to identify issues which need to be addressed. In some cases, we can solve certain problems or at least begin to draft possible solutions. However, the reality of this radical change is that for a while, at least, we will be 'flying by the seat of our pants.' While this is unsettling, and certainly not the ideal, we can begin to learn from our experimentation what might or might not work in the future.

We are trying to devise an entirely new way of working with very different concepts of who is working together and what each person's responsibilities will be. We all come to this process with varying opinions and assumptions. Our sharing of these must be tempered with a sensitiveness to the feelings of others if we are to work productively in our meetings. One of our groundrules is to focus on the task without personalizing issues to individuals or groups of individuals. Our focus should be on our goal of providing the best possible service to our users. There is not one right or wrong answer to how to best do this, and we may find we have to do a lot of trial and error in order to get as good as we can get.

These are not easy times. Change and ambiguity are difficult for us all. We ask your patience and cooperation in dealing with these uncertainties. And keep that communication coming!

Paula and Sue"

Note: part of this situation was the presence of a very vocal staff member, one without a college degree, who expressed criticism of professional librarians who wanted to distinguish between the service provided by the professionals and by the others. For her, and for others, the distinction between professional and non-professional staff was not one they wanted to accept or use as part of the role definitions. This position might be expressed by the expectation that anyone at the service desk could answer any question, or at least begin to answer it, and take it as far as they were able. They would answer the same way whether a librarian were on duty or it was after 7 pm and there was no librarian on duty. Referrals to another person should be kept to a minimum, and avoided if possible. Clients should not be told to have different expectations from librarians and others, but to take their questions to anyone on duty. The idea that librarians should monitor the adequacy of service being given by other staff would not be acceptable, in general, to those who take this position, so this role by librarians was never stated as expected. For those with this position, taking down the wall separating the information desk and the reference consultation area meant a leveling of roles, not the opportunity for librarians to have a closer role in monitoring the work of the desk staff and contributing to their continuing training. This decisive issue apparently was too sensitive to be addressed directly.

Deborah Mauro asked a pertinent question in an email, June 24: "How do we handle a situation if we overhear misinformation being given out? May a librarians interrupt (politely, graciously) a student assistant who is attempting to answer a reference question? Comments?"
Note: the understanding here is that a "reference question" by definition is one that should be handled by a reference librarian, so the student assistant should refer it to a reference librarian, and by not doing so is making a serious mistake.

Sue Baughman stated her position in an email on June 25: "I agree that patrons want correct information. As long as we give the patrons the assistance they need and it is correct, they are not going to be concerned about the type of staff that helped them."

After these memos, Cindy Todd was appointed as Service Plus manager. She had been in the Acquisitions Department, and served on the task force on service planning. She had almost no reference experience, and no academic library reference experience in recent years, except some roving assistant work at the online catalogs in McKeldin. She did not hold meetings to pursue the issues that had been raised. Weekly discussions stopped before the fall semester without decisions being made or agreements reached.

There seemed to be no cumulative, written list of the "issues which need to be addressed."

Service took place for the fall semester 1998 and continued in spring 1999 with the following situation:

-the roles and responsibilities of Cindy Todd (manager of Service Plus), library managers, librarians, library technicians, graduate student assistants, undergraduate student assistants, all working at the desk, were not clarified.
-no one was designated as being in charge during desk shilfts; each person was on their own, it seemed;
-there was no stated responsibility for librarians to play a role in monitoring the work of others, and providing on-the-spot training and needed corrections of errors or omissions (as a result, most librarians would be quite reluctant to do so);
-no guidelines on whether to stay near the desk or how long to help patrons were agreed on (if one person spends one hour with one patron, other staff on duty have to help all the others);
-there is no policy on what staff and students should do differently, if anything, when librarians are present and when they are not present;
-who should fix computers and printers and supply paper was not clarified; it was up to each person to decide;
-policies on referrals were not clarified;
-librarians, who formerly wore badges indicating that they were librarians, were no longer allowed to wear them; all staff are encouraged (not required) to wear the new general library badge; library users cannot tell by sight who are librarians and who are not;
-there is no provision for ongoing training;
-the connections between the desk staff and the rovers near the workstations (mostly staff from Technical Services, with almost no training in public service and the databases) were not clarified;
-there is no provision for or discussion of "Square One" type of service, to help novices get started on their research;
-there is no telephone reference policy;
-there is no policy on giving instruction as an integral part of giving information and reference assistance;
-there is no set of procedures for filing information resources at the desk, other than the manual;
-there was supposed to be ongoing evaluation of the changes at the Service Plus desk, but none has taken place, apparently

(Sue Baughman wrote in an email, June 25: “As we develop service and change the way we do things evaluation will be a critical element.We need to set up these evaluation mechanizsm throughout all of this planning. Feedback from the users will be very important.”)
-the staff had urged frequently that technical staff be provided to give service to the public workstations, and that the printers be improved - no action

Note: the exception to the lack of evaluation was a class project for LBSC 708P. Taught by Neal Kaske of EPSL, this class did exit interviews of library patrons as a class project in Nov. 1998. In reporting this project, designed as a learning project for students, Sue Baughman stated” “This exit survey is one of many tools that can be used. The Libraries will be developing an assessment plan so we will have a variety of ways to hear from our customers.” (Email Nov. 11, 1998).

Cindy Todd began doing the librarians’ desk schedule. She tried to do a single week schedule for the whole semester, to the great consternation of the librarians, who were used to a schedule on a week by week basis, to take their meetings, classes to teach, etc. into account. Later Cindy moved to a monthly schedule, giving librarians time to report scheduled events.

Cindy Todd schedules the librarians, but does not meet with them.
Sonia Bernardo schedules the library technicians.
Deborah Stefany supervises the work of the student assistants in shelving and reshelving the reference books.
Sonia Bernardo hires, trains, and schedules the student assistants.

The reference librarians on the subject teams work assigned shifts at the desk, but are not involved in any meetings which deal with the desk and have no forum in which to discuss the desk service. As a result, it is hard for them to “buy into” the general “service plus” philosophy other than as a general concept supposedly meaning good service. The meaning of “seamless” service, a new by-word, has never been explicated.

Sept 29, 1998: a draft of a tetephone policy was issued, but no final policy has yet be agreed on.

The Public Services Managers Group met Dec. 8, 1998, and their minutes show: “Concerns discussed centered around the following questions:

a. Do we all understand and accept the reasons for reorganization? The call for change and the plan for action are clearly stated in the Undergraduate Library Services in the 21st Century report and the Services Task Force of the University of Maryland Libraries report. The need for change has been pushing on the libraries for years.

b. Do we understand and accept that _all_ of our jobs have changed? And are we seeing our task as enabling others to access and utilize information?

c. Do we see the need to engage the faculty on a number of different topics related to the access and cost of information, as well as the value librarians add to the learning process all [sic] students?

d. Do we see that our reference jobs have changed and now go beyond working the desk to include collection development, formal instruction, working with the faculty and more?

e. Do we all agree who and how best to meet the information needs of our key users?

There was a consensus that we are 'all over the map' as to answers to these questions and that we need to work toward an agreed set of working answers to these questions. There was agreement that all need to learn our new jobs so we can all better serve our key user groups. Also, we need to develop this group as a team in order to work effectively within the new team environment."

Spring 1999:

A new group for dealing with the service desk (SIRS) was formed by Cindy Todd, with representatives from the teams.

The connections between the librarians on the teams and the work at the service desk are still up in the air. Some examples of issues that were raised:

-the political science database, ABC PoliSci, was cancelled by the subject librarian (who had been responsible for political science reference a short time) without any general consultation with other reference librarians, who then objected to the lack of consultation;

-a general policy that librarians and other staff should not bring any library work to the service desk was decided by the service desk group without nbotice to or involving the librarians, and this caused objections on both the process and the quality of the decision.

HEURISTICS

What would an observer look for as signs of "best practice" in a community of practice at a library service desk?

What conversations and sharing and documentation would be good practices for the development of the services?

The general parameters for evaluating the performance of reference assistance might be listed as these:
1- the times at which assistance is available

2- the level and quality of the staff, professionals and non-professionals, who provide service

3- the actual service provided

4- what support is being provided by management and other support services to assist in these services
-support for reference collections
-support for information and referral files
-support for continuing learning
-support for peer sharing
-support for equipment and services: offices, spaces, workstations, printers, photocopying, etc.

Quality of reference service staff:

The basic model for good reference staff is: a professional librarian with these characteristics:

-knowledge (and ongoing learning to keep up to date) of the reference sources, in the library and elsewhere (local libraries, remote access)

-knowledge in depth as certain subject fields, based on advanced degrees, for advanced assistance and for knowledge of the advanced research strategies within general areas (such as humanities, business, etc.)

-knowledge of the relevant languages for service

-experience in the skills of giving reference service in an adademic situation: the professional-client interactions in support of learning oriented to present needs (courses, curricula) and lifelong learning (as professional, as citizen, as person)

-motivation to do a good job and to do all the ongoing learning and work for current awareness of what is new in the media and in scholarly work (general and in assigned specialties)

key heuristic questions:
(a) At any given moment, how many of the professional librarians giving service fit the model?

For example, in an approximate typical week in March 1999 at the McKeldin service desk:

reference service hours: 62 out of total of 89 service hours.
Usually there are two librarians assigned, with three on staggered hours on weekends. There is no systematic pairing of experienced and inexperienced librarians on duty.

LIbrarians hired for academic reference service in McKeldin by competitive search, 2 with relevant master's degrees, now part of new teams:
4 (28 hours),
Librarians hired for academic reference service in Hornbake, moved to Mckeldin, now part of new teams:
2 (11 hours)
Librarians hired as bibliographers with no reference service work in McKeldin, now part of new teams:
3 (23 hours)
Librarians working at the desk, whose primary reponsibilities are managerial, one of whom has relevant academic reference experience, and are not part of new teams:
3 (20 hours)
Librarian hired as contract professional staff for other positions, who have been assigned to do reference service and serve as part of a new team:
1 (7 hours)
Librarian hired as contract professional staff for reference work in McKeldin, now part of a new team (renewal every 6 months) (changed to permanent half-time position in April 1999, with additional contract hours):
1 (6 hours)
Librarians hired as contract professional staff for a non-reference position, subsequently given regular staff appointment, now assigned for service at the desk, not part of one of the new teams:
1 (4 hours)
Librarian formerly working with non-reference position in Hornbake, now assigned to reference work in McKeldin
1 (5 hours)
Librarian assigned to McKeldin from National Agriculture Library for one day a week:
1 (3 hours)
CLIS graduate student assigned to fill professional time slot at the McKeldin desk, not on a new subject team [note: a CLIS student who was at the desk but not listed as equivalent to a librarian for duty wondered why and what basis the distinction was made]:
1 (2 hours)

Summary: out of 109 service hours, only 28 are now being provided by reference librarians who were hired for such positions and are now part of the new subject teams. An additional 11 hours are being filled by experienced reference librarians formerly in Hornbake, who have to work on learning the McKeldin resources. The collection management coordinator job description, held by Karla Hahn, was listed as contributing some hours to refernence service, but she has not done so, apparently at her request. This may have caused some resentment.

Note: in the recent past four experienced reference librarians, one with a Ph.D. and one with a M.A., have left McKeldin, all with indications that the poor working conditions and lack of recognition were major factors in their willingness to move. In recent years it has been very difficult to keep bibliographers with advanced degrees also.

A fair amount of analysis would have to be done, perhaps based on activity-based costing and time logs for librarians as well as patterns of user needs (time of semester, time of day), but it would be highly desirable to know what the ideal complement of bibliographer-reference-instruction librarians would be. When a quick comparison was done recently of the peer institutions, some figures were displayed, based on the comparable subjects covered:
University of Maryland, McKeldin Library
    9 FTE permanent reference librarians + 4 bibliographers = 13
Comparable peers:
University of Arizona
    27 subject specialists = 9 undergraduate ref librarians = 36
University of Illinois
    10 general reference librarians and 24 subject specialists = 34
University of Texas
    22 ref librarians in the main library plus 14 ref lib from department libraries on campus + ? bibliographers = 36
Ohio State University
    10 ref lib plus librarians from departmental libraries 16 = 36
From the report by Marti Hooker and Jerri Kenny, "Subject Specialist Staffing Levels in ARL Peer Institutions Compared to McKeldin Subject Specialists" (12/11/97).

Related question: Is there ongoing peer training or other systematic learning for those with less than full qualifications? Not at the time, it seems.

This situation will change when new subject team librarians are hired, and they learn how to work in the McKeldin setting. It will be recalled that before the Libraries' budget suffered the loss of positions, there were 9 reference librarians in Hornbake and about 11 or 12 in Mckeldin. Will the Libraries be able to do more with less, with two service sites reduced to one?

(b) At any given moment, do the staff met on first encounter have the ability (and perform) to deal with the presenting question and move the person to the right assistance, referring to a reference librarian when needed? This is key: many librarians think that only the refernce librarian has enough knowledge to make the referrals: others do not know what they do not know, and cannot learn unless they are working under direct supervison and observation of a *reference librarian. Student staff or non-*professional staff who attempt to answers questions inappropriately not only waste the time of the clients, but they may teach erroneous information which impedes rather than advances the learning of the client.

(c) At any given moment, is there a librarian available to help within a reasonable waiting time? what is the queue? how often do potential clients leave because the wait would not be practicable?

Related service issues: how do clients using the electronic resources off-site ask questions and get answers? (Remote users can phone AITS for assistance from computer assistance counselors between the hours of, and either get help at the time or a call back)

Management and planning services

E. Management and planning services: how and to what degree do they help?

From the perspectives of the service departments of the Libraries and the library users, it if often difficult to tell how effective and efficient the support services are. Specific services are visible, some of which are provided directly by general university services (such as building operations and maintenance and cleaning, and general network capabilities), but more behind-the-scene operations such as purchasing, training, personnel, etc., are less open to observation. Is there any need for a "re-inventing government" process? Are there too many support staff or middle managers? Studies would need to be done of work-flow, or studies of best practices in comparable organizations. The Libraries could be asked, however, what they are doing to make support facilities more efficient.

In these complex areas I will try to open up directions for others to develop needed heuristic frameworks in more detail.

The top management is the Library Executive Council (LEC).

The only continuing member going into summer of 1999 from when the dean began in October 1996 is Desider Vikor, Director of Collection Management and Special Collections.

Public Services: Lori Goetsch began in Sept. 1997.

She has been involved in the reorganization of the division.

She has created advisory groups of librarians and other staff which generally meet monthly for discussions.

ITD: after the acting period of Anthony Conto, Howard Harris began in Feb. 1999.

The turnover has been rather large in this division, as might be expected. The division supports the LIMS, the main computer system, and also, to varying degrees, the workstations in the other divisions. How well do they do these tasks?

Technical Services: at the end of April 1999 Marietta Plank moved to a new position, still located in McKeldin , that of executive secretary for Chesapeake Information and Research Library Alliance (CIRLA). She remains on the University of Maryland payroll and takes the new position by the dean's power to reassign staff. It is not known (to me) whether she has the same salary, or to what extent it comes out of the library budget. She had limited her work week hours for some years because of health problems. The implications are for possible major changes in the management approaches in this division with an acting director and then a new director.

A Serials Group has been developed, a new version of a kind of group present over the years, for coordination of the exchange of information about serials. For a time there was only an informal connection with Nancy Caldwell, head of McKeldin Periodicals, and not with other public service periodicals staff.

The TSD Help Desk has taken problem reports and claims to use them for systemic improvements. How effective has this been?

A committee was formed to work out priorities for cataloging uncataloged parts of the collection. How is this working out? How are funds allocated?

Planning and Administrative Services

A new division, with first head Jane Williams.

Some personnel questions

-How many staff have been placed in apparently peripheral positions? Are they doing full professional work?

Specifically:

Harrar, H. Joanne, Executive Administrative Assistant to Dean of Libraries (formerly Director of Libraries): assigned to promote entrepreneurial activities.

Gary Kraske, special assistant to Director of Planning and Administrative Services, former Associate Director of Administrative Services. Responsible for Hornbake Library building changes. He manages the Investors Club, listed as affiliated with the Friends of the Libraries (using library space for meetings): does he use work time for this?

Larsen, Ronald, Assistant to the Dean of Librarian- on leave from campus for government work; listed as assistant to the dean (is returning to campus for USM position on education and technology in 1999, but this has not been announced to the Libraries)

Plank, Marietta, CIRLA executive director (see above).

Masnik, Ann, McKeldin Public Services, Diversity Coordinator (formerly, before illness, reference librarian in Hornbake)

One of the new positions created by the dean is manger, Management Information Systems. The position was filled by transferring Irma Dillon, who was a supervisor, then staff person, in the Information Technology Division. The principle question would be: what is she providing in terms of added-value to the Libraries? We assume she has taken over the handling of the statistics which the Libraries have to report to various national statistics collecting agencies, such as the Department of Education and the Association of Research Libraries. There seem to have been no new products.

The Libraries need to decide what statistics they want for their use. More, what studies should be done, and how can the Libraries move the kinds of percentage of full quality statistics required for continuous improvement?

Another basic approach available to this office is to use the various standards for good performance developed and promulgated by the Association of College and Research Libraries. In the April 1999 issue of College & Research Libraries News there are reports of the following ACRL Standards and Guidelines:

Guidelines for media resources in academic libraries

Guidelines for the security of rare book, manuscript, and other special collections: a draft

Heuristic: Are all the standards collected, easily available, and integrated into decision-making processes?

These and all the other standards could be used for conversations and deliberations by the librarians, and then for the development of specific performance measures when appropriate.

Heuristic: Are the Libraries taking advantage of studies from the library school? Library management faculty and students could do and share studies. Alan Mattlage, for example, did a paper based on his experiences while working as a graduate student in Technical Services and serving on a library task force. The dean teaches the academic library seminar in some semesters as part of his position as a professor in CLIS. Perhaps the directions opened up in this study might inspire further studies by CLIS students under the direction of CLIS faculty.

The staff are concerned with the operation of the PRD system., which has been changed by the managers into a management by objectives system. The move to MBO may seem odd, since the conventional wisdom is that that system was tried years ago (primarily in the 1970s), and found to have fatal flaws. It seems to be a command and control system, in which workers can be told in advance what to do, based on an overall strategic plan and then appraised on how well they do it, by someone who monitors their work. In the case of the team members, many managers set the objectives and then will report on their observations of the team member's performance.

See the comments by John Macdonald on MBO:

Macdonald, John. Calling a Halt to Mindless Change: A Plea for Commonsense Management. New York: AMACOM, 1998.

"In MBO, executives determine the overall objectives of the company for the year ahead and then assign operational objectives to their key managers. Each operational department then assigns performance goals to the middle managers, hopefully in line with the original objectives, and they in turn carry the process on down with objectives for the supervisors. In other words, this is deploymnet of key performance goals down through the organization. At first sight, is appears very reasonabled; but as we shall see, it isn't.

"One reason for the ineffectiveness of MBO is thta is usually incorporates or is allied to a performance appraisal system. . . The combination of systems is a lethal cocktail that has impeded Western business for two decades. . . .In recent years we have begun to understand the divisive effects of specialization on the organization. MBO in practice is a corollary of this process and is often the reinforcing agent in changing a group of highly individuals into an ineffective organization. Establishment of objectives in this environment is more truthfully expressed as the blind leading the blind." (p. 52)

This gives the flavor of his analysis.

In sum, knowledgeable people find MBO, and in fact every usual personal performance appraisal system, as in fact destructive, and incompatible with both team work and continuous quality improvement, both of which seek to develop and empower group responsibility for high standards and changes for the better.

Heuristic: see how the MBO actually works in the 1999-2000 year. Ask the librarians what they think of it, and the ratings of the performance appraisal system and the numbers of the separate merit system.

Staff are concerned with the general level of salaries, and the implications of differentials in salaries. Professional librarians with subject expertise (master's, doctor's degrees) and decades of experience are concerned that support staff who are not professional librarians with fewer years experience may earn over $15,000 more than they do. Why?

Staff are concerned with the fact that the approved professional leave program has not yet been implemented, and even the guidelines and procedures have not yet been issued and applications invited.

Staff are concerned with the merit pay process.
The previous procedure generally followed in spring 1997. One of the librarians, Allan Rough, met personally with dean to protest variations in judgments and recommendations in divisions and units.
The dean issued an email apology to staff July 21, 1997), saying he hadthought the procedure was OK to continue as it was, now he saw the need to study and improve the system. "I too am dissatisfied with the method we use for awarding merit."
A new procedure was developed without staff input, different from what had been designed by the staff committee, and announced in the Library Matters of Feb. 6, 1998. "On the new form, supervisors will be adksed to score the employee's performance on a 1.000 to 5.00 scalse where 1 is unsatisfactory and 5 is excellent." When the merit awards were decided individuals received letters, but there was no general announcement or identifying who received awards, contrary to past practice. Upon being queried, Ray Foster, Personnel librarian, reported in an email October 12, 1998: "LEC decided not to print the names of staff receiving merit."

Staff:
-How well are the support positions assigned?
-are professional librarians provided with appropriate technical support?
-are non-professional support staff, such as in budget & personnel, (8 staff, including 1 librarian as manager) facilities well utilized? are there too many or too few?
-how effective is the full-time staff development manager?

The budget of the LIbraries:
With the reassignment of Gary Kraske, the Personnel Officer, Ray Foster was given the duties of Budget Officer also. In the fall of 1998 he gave a report to the staff about the budget. In general, the staff have been little informed about the budget and have little or no imput into the allocations.

There are numerous income sources: what does each contribute, and what are their trajectories?
state allocation
categories, limits
gifts
gifts-in-kind
book sales
charges for services

        photocopying
        binding
        searching for a fee (being investigated?)
        University College room use
        other room rental charges
    library fines
    grants
    MILO funds for interlibrary loan services

USM funds for Dialog CIP (Classroom Instruction) project

DRIF funds (see faculty memo, follow-up?)

There are other library-related budgets on campus: what are they?
    Paul Wasserman Library (CLIS)
    departmental libraries (instructional materials)
    major holdings outside the libraries
Some departments make major contributions to the support of *their* library (art, chemistry, e.g.)
What accountability for all the other libraries is there?
What is the official position of the Library Council on accountability for funds which departments spend on library resources (books, periodicals, CDs, database subscriptions, nonprint media, etc,) for use within the departments?

-Fundraising: how well is it working?
Several fundraising positions are not library lines, but are part of the University Advancement budget:
Director, Friends of the Libraries
Major Gifts Officer
    (major gifts now defined as over $25,000)

Several library staff are involved in obtaining gifts:
-Gifts-in-Kind Coordinator: deals with donations of books and journals and other items (efforts are made to estimate dollar value of what is obtained and added to the collections)
-Grants manager: assists the Libraries in making grant proposals.

Friends of the Libraries became formally organized in Feb. 1998, with an appointed board and by-laws instead of a task force. The Director provides a monthly report to the Board, which is available in her office. There are approximately 400 dues-paying members of the Friends. Efforts are being made to send membership renewal notices on anniversaries. In addition, there is being created the first annual report of the Friends of the Libraries, by the Sharon J. Stanczak, Director. The report for FY99 will include information on activities and income for FY99, such as a list of board members, descriptions of solicitations, incomeearned, and programmatic efforts. At the latest report Friends had generated $68,170. The report is to be published in Library Matters and the Friends membership newsletter.

Formal library staff involvement in campus governance:
The dean and some other library staff have ex-officio positions in the Senate. There is one elected librarian in the Senate. The LEC is seeking to bring about more representation for other library staff in the Senate, more than just part of the clerical and technical categories.
Bob Merikangas wrote list of Senate and committee members for an issue of Library Matters, but in general there is no list of library staff in the Senate or on Senate committees available to the staff, and no coordination of library staff; nothing like a hypothetical "library caucus."

The dean has a highly visible role on campus, as a member of the Council of Deans and of APAC, and of various appointed committees from time to time (such as committee to select a new president). What happens in these contexts is generally not known to the library staff.

How have the strategic plans and task force recommendations helped? How do we use them for historical and heuristic documentation?

The major planning documents being used or potentially to be used by the Libraries are these:

Campus strategic plan

Graduate Program Review Committee: The rather controversial report of this group ranked graduate departments on campus so that more support could be directed to the better programs. In the discussions of moving funds from weaker to stronger mention has made of various direct investments in programs, and moving TAs, but not of library support. The Libraries are assuming that library collection funds should also be moved to support stronger programs. How will this be done? Presumably as a part of fund allocation formula now being developed (see Collections section). This priority was expressed a a memo thusly: new money "should focus on departments that were rated highly in the Graduate Program Review OR they should be cross-disciplinary or interdisciplinary in nature." (Harvey 3/11/99).

Middle States: How does the campus use the ten-year and five-year interim reviews by the Middle States re-accrediting process? Much of what is gained depends on the initiative of the campus, and the follow-up to each self-study and report by the visiting team.

The most recent Middle States process was in 1996-1997, part of the ten-year sequence of 1976-1986-1996. The Evaluation Team representing the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools submitted a report "prepared after study of the institution's self-study report and a visit to the campus on April 6-9, 1997."

Some key library-related points in the self-study sections:

First, it should be noted that the 85-86 self-study gave priority attention to the library, and a follow-up extensive report was provided in the 1991 5-year review. The recommendations from these earlier reports were not used in 1996 to follow-up on the status of the library, and so there is a loss of continuity. Some of the earlier emphases on the need to integrate bibliographic instruction with each major were picked up in the CQI (Klumpp report) recommendations on undergraduate services.

The self-study focused on these areas, using task forces, from an educational perspective: undergraduate education, graduate education, research and service, interdisciplinary research and programs, and faculty and staff issues.

Undergraduate education: No attention is given to the libraries. The Center for Teaching Excellence is emphasized. One of the major problems facing the Libraries is the difficulty in working with the fragmented structure of the campus: how are the general relationships between library use and education to be discussed and improvements made? In the conclusion of the section: "The new Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Education, with representatives to be appointed by both the Senate and the Dean for Undergraduate Studies, is an important first step; but in a year's time [Feb. 1998?] we urge the campus to consider if this group should be granted greater powers than envisaged at the present. It is important that the campus have the administrative structure which best assures excellence in undergraduate education."

What is the structure in Spring 1999?

What are the initiatives of the Dean for Undergraduate Studies?

Some specific points suggested for improvement that should link to the Libraries:

-involve undergraduates more in research in their own courses and in faculty research

-"continue to explore constructive approaches to student outcomes assessment that help to demonstrate institutional effectiveness while generating useful information for academic and student services" [the way this is worded shows a possible conflict between 'we are excellent' PR motives and the need to measures areas where improvement is needed]

-implement the initiatives in the Strategic Plan

Graduate education: Most of the material in this category is oriented to research objectives. This statement may have significance to the Libraries: "while at the University of Maryland at College Park there is about one research assistant for very three teaching assistants, at other, comparable research universities these numbers tend to be about equal."

Research opportunities and initiatives: It is in the category that the Libraries are supported., by supporting the recommendations of the Strategic Plan. The report notes the growing complexity of scholarly information, and adds: "In consequence, the roles of libraries and of librarians, as information mediators, will increasingly involve close collaboration with faculty to design effective strategies for incorporating information into a changing curriculum. At the same time, a renewed teaching effort will be required to teach students about the structure of networked information and to assist them in their classroom and library research. Finally, as the library of the flagship institution, the University's library carries the additional responsibility of service as the State's research library."

Note that in a different section mention is made of the need to make sure that DRIF money is used in ways consistent with its basic purpose. Some faculty have raised the issue that more DRIF money should go to support the libraries (see memos sent to the administration by Dr Brush and others). What will happen with this question over time? When it was raised, then-president Brit Kirwan stated clearly in his letter in response to the faculty that the libraries were not enough of a priority to move money from other areas. Kirwan: The idea of simply allocating more indirect cost revenue to deal with this problem is appealing. However, the needs of the libraries, which are every bit as significant as you describe them, must compete with other compelling, legitimate requests for funding to support research efforts. . . . . We often find that to relieve pressure in one area, such as facilities requirements, we have to set aside, at least temporarily, the needs of another area, such ass the Libraries. "(letter of October 4, 1996)
The report gives recommended specifics on allocating money to the Libraries, from DRIF, University College, summer programs, and hard money when new programs are approved.

Staff: The report gives extensive attention to support for the staff, so the Libraries should be making maximum use of the section. What is being done? I have never heard it mentioned.
Some major points:
"The University should develop ways to create an environemnt which supports and encourages staff contributions to student learning, drawing upon all categories of employees and out-of-classroom programs and experiences. To facilitate this learning opportunity and miaximize the use of its human

resources, the institution should provide training and support to help employees promote student learning."

"Although much has been done, the University should develop ways to increase the involvement of non-instructional employees, including retired [!!!] faculty and staff, in student learning, providing rewards and incentives for their good efforts and addressing issues of morale that will provide the staff as contibuting role in the development of a total 'campus community.'"

The report acknowledges that staff have concerns about links between the PRD and pay, since they do not have confidence in the system.

This report in its whole should be used by the Library Council and library staff.

Faculty: The report notes that, yes, the faculty need higher compensation, but also notes that assessment of faculty teaching effectiveness is needed, such as by teaching portfolios. If faculty have to document their teaching, the ways in which they carry out the mandated collaboration with the Libraries can be demostrated and shared. Of course, the librarians who teach should also have teaching portfolios, for their own needs as well as program needs, whether or not they are needed for promotion dossiers.

Allocation of resources: The funds for implementation of the Strategic Plan should be provided, while the University reviews programs and cuts some in order to enhance others. This would supply some increased funds for the Libraries, with the corresponding need for the Libraries to make internal priority judgments.

In a chapter called "framing the discourse for the future" the report stresses these points:

-the use of technology in instruction must be developed and coordinated, and they list the issues as areas to be addressed.

-interdisciplinary programs and research activities: The report states "the current climate . . . can be described as an environment that is generally supportive, but neither universally nor uncritically favorable to interdisciplinary activities."

-Which problems should the University focus on?

-How can the "dynamic relationships between estasbilshed disciplines and interdisciplinary activities" be dealt with?

-entrepreneurial activities: The need to expand in the marketplace affects all: how will the Libraries do this? The dean has assigned the former director of libraries to a new position to develope entrepreneurial activities and presumably judge the risks and the opportunities for profits.

-continuing education: the report shows the issues, especially for faculty, and also for support facilities such as libraries. The Libraries relations with University College over the years have shown many of the issues.

-Human resource development: the issues "will require sensitive and thoughtful discussion." Certainly.

-issue: "more authority and accountabity at less central levels" -- what should be the authority and accountability of the Libraries for human resource development and a general learning environment for staff?

What is needed above all? "Full and balanced discussions that encourage participation from the University community and, where appropriate, a larger public should help in providing guidance and in securing acceptance of worthwhile changes."
Where is the ongoing discussion, using the frames for discourse in this lengthy report?

Some relevant points that may be gleaned from the reports:
-the campus needs the long-sought capstone courses
-teaching portfolios for post-tenure review could include library instruction components
-TA training has been increased, but more library involvement is needed
-undergraduate working with faculty as researchers should learn about literature review activities
-a library skills component (broadly defined information literacy) should be integral to any student outcomes assessment (such as student portfolios)
-library staff should be encouraged to participate in student advising, such as the Advise5 program
-library staff should be encouraged to become involved in campus out-of-classroom educational programs and to work with student organizations (perhaps as advisors) [personal note: I have never received any support, even verbal, or even any expression of interest, by library managers, for my work as Advise5 advisor or as a student group advisor or as organizer of campus programs or as a Diversity Database editor]
-who in the Libraries should be giving time to developing profit-making entrepreneurial activities?
-we need to get data from alumni to improve our programs (and also benefit from their support)
-leadership training for emerging staff leaders is recommended
-the Libraries should implement the professional leave/sabbatical program, which has been created

Some key library-related points in the evaluation team report:
First, the whole report should be used for its perspective on the University's own reflective work.
The team noted the Klumpp report and steps being taken to improve the Libraries.
The team noted the recommendation for student outcome assessment, and the existence of other measures and statistics, and comments:
"The committee found little evidence of faculty inclusion [or librarian] in these processes and a corresponding lack of attention to student learning outcomes

assessment. As the purpose of outcomes assessment is the improvement of teaching and learning, faculty [librarian?] engagement in outcomes assessment would appear to an important part of the University's efforts to improve undergraduate education. Faculty ownership of the outcomes assessment process is critical to both implementation and success. " (p. 11)
"The committee recommends that faculty [librarians] become more involved in setting comprehensive goals for student learning in general education and in the majors, collecting data on student accomplishments in coursework and outside class, and using the findings to improve curricula, methods of instruction, and student services." (p. 12, and p. 37)

Pease report: Promises to Keep--
The Pease report has guided the actions to improve undergraduate education since it was published. In 1999 a review of its implementation in relation to the CORE curriculum is being made, by a group chaired by Dr Thomas Regan of Engineering. It is not clear what the process is for this review.

Heuristics: How have in the past and how in the future do the Libraries make effective use of the self-studies and evaluations called for by Middle States to improve the Libraries and to promote the integration of the Libraries into the campus activities? In particular, how do the Libraries use the Middle States emphasis on the extent of resource-based learning on the campus, as evidence that students use the libraries (stressed especially by Howard Simmons during his tenure)? Middle States assumes that the mere existence of a collection, no matter what size, is not proof that the Libraries meet the research and educational needs and goals of the campus.

Libraries' strategic plan: Prior to the coming of the dean in 1996, the Libraries had a strategic plan (Dec. 1994) endorsed by the authorities. He was then asked to update the plan as a basis for requesting additional funds for the Libraries. In summarizing some of the main points of the plan and its later specifications I will not give much attention to those features designed to ask for significant additional funding, but give greater attention to plans for activities which could be done or at least begun. By April 1997 the dean had a text of a new strategic plan, which he prepared with the help of selected advisors. There was no general awareness or discussion. Some leaked copies aroused great interest in those who would be affected by decisions being incorporated in the plan. After the plan was released, the dean held two public sessions for the staff to discuss it and answer questions. He acknowledged that so far the planning and goal-setting had been top-down, but said it would change to a more CQI-based approach. The Library Council had seen the plan, not so much for content as to make the presentation of it to APAC and others (council of deans, president's cabinet) more effective. He summarized the positions being asked for, and indicated hopes for new facilities in the next 10 years: an engineering/science library building and an off-site storage building.

Some points of interest:
The plan could draw on the Klumpp Report and the support given to the Libraries in the Middle States report.
The plan indicates that both reference services and the new Square One services will be in McKeldin and that "as these new services are developed they must logically and consistently interrelated with existing services for graduate students."
It was anticipated that the Undergraduate Academic Center would be planned by the Libraries, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, aITs, and a new Undergraduate Council (no planning group has been created, and it is clear that it will not be planned for location in Hornbake, as was the original intention).
User Education Services was assigned the general responsibility for leadership in developing collaborative work between librarians and faculty in instructing students and creating new assignments. See the User Education section: in general, no action other than continuing library-sponsored general workshops has been done.
There was concern expressed about the need of duplicate copies of books for undergraduates: "high use materials must be duplicated to insure maximium availability." The Collection Analysis Project should be used to do this. "Capabilities of the Libraries' local system to generate data reports on collection usage are critical."
Much of the plan deals with funds needed for upgrading of the technological infrastructure and for more materials.
A key statement in relation to later plans: "As a result of staff recisions during the previous six years, the Libraries lost four of eight bibliographer positions, that were explicitly created to build -- in concert with the faculty -- credible research level collections comparable to those of our peers. For any significant increase in resources for new materials, there must be a commensurate increase in staffing. In order to maximize outreach to individual faculty and academic units, the Libraries will aggressively examine alternate and creative organizational structures for staffing, including matrix management and other re-engineering models so that these positions will be used optimally."
So it was clear that the effort to create a staff of bibliographers separate from the reference librarians had failed, and the obstacle that there were two different divisions involved, Collection Management and Special Collections on the one hand and Public Services on the other hand, had meant little cooperation in the past. New ways for the same people to do the work of both divisions had to be found, although the branch librarians had always been doing it.

In an email 15 April 1997 the dean stated: "I want to respond to some expressions of concern which have come to my attention about the Libraries Strategic Planning process and the desire that staff be involved in the effort. . .

. I know that there is a measure of anxiety about just how much has already been 'decided' by 'administration.' . . . My main reason for this communication is to allay any concerns that this planning has been preemptory of greater participation by all staff. I think you will find that it has not."
He indicated that staff would be involved in working on the details.

In an email on 5 May 1997 the dean stated: "It is my intent to have at least a twice yearly meeting of the staff to give a 'state of the library' address and have Q&A." This has not been done.

The update to the strategic plan in March 1999 was presented as a report and recommendations of the Strategic Planning Task Force, chaired by Jane Williams. [I have seen only the 2/11/99 draft]. Some of the main points:
-The goals dealing with undergraduate and graduate education were merged.
-"During the review of the plan it became evident that in addition to the recommendations for updates and additions to the Initiatives and their related goals there should be a mechanism established to assure on-going planning and evaluation." This would be an annual cycle.
The plan to have a Square One center and and Undergraduate Academic Center is dropped with no explanation.
The need to improve user programs with faculty is affirmed.
The attention to the need for duplicates is dropped.
Effects of partnerships with USM and CIRLA libraries are to be evaluated.
More storage space is needed.
Improve or merge EPSL and White libraries.
Improve or merge Art and Architecture libraries.

Annual reports:

For years each division of the Libraries has provided annual reports of goals and what has been achieved, and statistics. The pattern has been dropped, and no new system has taken its place as a way to manage objectives and achievements. A new form of reporting is being created, the dean's annual report, based on the divisional reports (one of which, Public Services, was placed on the Web in fall 1998), but going beyond them. This new annual report is designed more as a public relations document than as a management tool. It includes photopgraphs, is being printed, and stresses the acquisition of special collections. Coming out in March/April 1999, this new document will be distributed to deans and department heads, the Library Council, others on campus, and libraries in the USM and around the country. It will be used in communications with potential donors.

Final note: Comments and critiques will be gratefully received and acknowledged by the author. RJM